



# GREEK BRONZES

BY

A. S. MURRAY, LL. D.



EX LIBRIS




*Velut Arbor Aevo*

JOHN S. BENNETT

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2017 with funding from  
University of Toronto



British Museum

Walter L. Collins Th. Jr.

*Archae. Figure, Sixth Century, B.C.*

# GREEK BRONZES

By

A. S. MURRAY, LL.D., F.S.A.

*Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum*



LONDON

SEELEY AND CO., LIMITED, GREAT RUSSELL STREET

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1898

2619

APR 21 1949



# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

## COPPERPLATES

	PAGE
I. Archaic Figure. Sixth Century B.C. British Museum . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
II. Hypnos, God of Sleep. Early Fourth Century B.C. British Museum .	72
III. Zeus. From Dodona. British Museum . . . . .	80
IV. Heroic Figure. British Museum . . . . .	82

## ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE TEXT

FIG.

1. Gaulish Female Prisoner. British Museum . . . . .	5
2. Bronze Mirror-case. Greek work, about 400 B.C. British Museum .	7
3. Bronze Statuette. Apollo of Miletus. British Museum . . . . .	11
4. Archaic Bronze Victory. British Museum . . . . .	17
5. Marble Victory by Archermos. Athens . . . . .	19
6. Archaic Greek Bronze. British Museum . . . . .	23
7. Archaic Greek Bronze. British Museum . . . . .	24
8. Archaic Etruscan Statuette. Man carrying a Calf. British Museum .	26
9. Etruscan Heracles. British Museum . . . . .	27
10. Archaic Etruscan Bronze. British Museum . . . . .	29
11. Archaic Etruscan Statuette. British Museum . . . . .	31
12. Etruscan Mirror. British Museum . . . . .	33
13. Archaic Etruscan Mirror. British Museum . . . . .	34
14. Bronze Etruscan Mirror with Relief. Heracles carrying off a Woman. Archaic —Sixth Century B.C. British Museum . . . . .	37
15. Marble Statue. Diadumenos of Vaison. British Museum . . . . .	43
16. Marble Statue. Diadumenos Farnese. British Museum . . . . .	43
17. Marble Head of Amazon. British Museum . . . . .	45
18. Bronze Statuette. Hermes. British Museum . . . . .	47

FIG.		PAGE
19.	Greek Bronze. British Museum . . . . .	50
20.	Bronze Marsyas. British Museum . . . . .	51
21.	Marble Athenè Parthenos. Athens . . . . .	55
22.	Athenè Parthenos. Bronze Statuette. British Museum . . . . .	55
23.	Athenè Promachos. Greek Bronze. British Museum . . . . .	57
24.	Coin of Elis, representing the Zeus of Pheidias. From an Enlarged Drawing	59
25.	Zeus. Bronze found in Hungary. British Museum . . . . .	61
26.	Hermes by Praxiteles. Olympia . . . . .	66
27.	Marble Statue. Apollo Sauroctonos. Louvre . . . . .	67
28.	Apollo. From Thessaly. British Museum . . . . .	68
29.	Bronze Statuette. Aphrodite Pourtalès. British Museum . . . . .	69
30.	Marble Statue of an Apoxyomenos. Vatican Museum . . . . .	73
31.	Limestone Figure of Heracles. British Museum . . . . .	74
32.	Bronze Statuette from Dodona (Paramythia). Poseidon. Ancient base. British Museum . . . . .	77
33.	Bronze Statuette from Dodona (Paramythia). Youth pouring Libation. British Museum . . . . .	79
34.	Bronze Relief. Greek striking down an Amazon. Fourth Century B.C. British Museum . . . . .	83
35.	Alexander the Great. Large Bronze Statuette. Naples Museum . . . . .	85
36.	Bronze found at Barking Hall, Suffolk. British Museum . . . . .	87
37.	Gaulish Statuette of Bacchus. British Museum . . . . .	89
38.	Heracles. Found in Cumberland. British Museum . . . . .	91
39.	Gaulish Statuette of Mars. British Museum . . . . .	95
40.	Gaulish Heracles. Bronze Statuette found at Vienne in France . . . . .	97
41.	Gaulish Chief. Bronze Statuette. British Museum . . . . .	99

*Most of the Bronzes in the British Museum are reproduced from Photographs taken for this Monograph by Mr. Alexander Mackie, F.R.P.S.*

# GREEK BRONZES

## I

### *Archaic Statuettes—General Remarks*

IN a large collection of ancient bronze statuettes, such as that of the British Museum, there are necessarily many which have no particular merit as works of art, yet even the most insignificant of them may here and there be of service to an artist. Let me give an instance. We have a very small bronze of a Gaulish woman—apparently a prisoner of war—which hardly any one would think of stopping to look at (Fig. 1). It happens, however, that a distinguished French sculptor, M. Chapu, caught sight of this figure, and made a sketch of it many years ago when on a visit here. Time passed, and he produced his celebrated statue of Joan of Arc, where she is represented seated on the ground with both hands clasped vigorously round one knee. Our statuette is also seated on the ground, and there is no doubt that this posture was characteristic of Gaulish women in circumstances of despair. Thereupon a candid archæologist wrote to the sculptor



FIG. 1.—*Gaulish Female Prisoner.*  
*British Museum.*

calling his attention to the resemblance between his statue and the small bronze in the British Museum. M. Chapu searched his notebooks, found the sketch he had made, and forwarded it along with a drawing of his own statue. The resemblance extends only to the posture of the two figures ; and the most that can be said is, that the sight of our small bronze may have helped the sculptor unconsciously to select, from among other conceptions then floating in his mind, the one which he finally worked out. The moral of the story seems to be that the most insignificant of our statuettes may, on a propitious occasion, render a true service to an artist. And the reason no doubt is this, that many of them reproduce the conceptions of men more gifted than the actual makers of the statuettes.

At present we know almost nothing of who the men were who made our bronze statuettes, whether they had been attached to the workshops of sculptors, or whether they were a class by themselves, standing in much the same relation to the sculptors as the painters of Greek vases stood to the great painters of their day. Most probably they were a class of minor artists created by the constant demand for statuettes to be dedicated in the temples. The excavations on the Acropolis of Athens and at Olympia have shown how vast must have been the number of the statuettes deposited by devotees in these places.

On the other hand, it does not follow that the whole of our bronze statuettes had been made by this special class of craftsmen. We are told of one sculptor whose small models fetched extravagant prices, and we can believe that even greater men than he had occasionally produced statuettes finished with every accuracy of detail, and had allowed them to be cast in bronze. There may have been some etiquette limiting the production of such figures. That we do not know ; but certainly not a few of our statuettes are of such excellence that we can hardly believe them to be the work of minor craftsmen, notwithstanding the extraordinary skill we see occasionally displayed by those other craftsmen, the vase-painters.

We have almost no direct information as to how far bronze statuettes had been employed by the Greeks for the adornment of their dwelling-houses. We know that Alexander the Great carried about on his campaigns a small bronze Heracles, the work of his favourite sculptor Lysippos. In Roman times Sulla carried in his bosom when in battle a

small figure of Apollo, and much the same is told of Nero and of Hadrian. We may fairly conjecture that the desire to be surrounded in their homes by beautiful bronzes had been customary among the well-to-do people of antiquity. Pompeii and Herculaneum were essentially



FIG. 2.—*Bronze Mirror-case.*

*Greek work, about 400 B.C. British Museum.*

Greek towns. Possibly enough the luxury of private life may have been greater there than in the older cities of Greece proper. But even making a liberal allowance of that kind, we should still be struck by the number of beautiful bronzes in the museum of Naples, collected from the ruins of private houses at Pompeii and Herculaneum. In many instances these



bronzes were attached to pieces of furniture, or were kept in show-cases, as nowadays. Larger specimens stood on pillars. These bronzes are exclusively of Greek workmanship, and we may fairly suppose that in Greece itself there had prevailed a more or less similar degree of household taste. At present we have at all events this testimony, that in Greek tombs of the best age there are frequently discovered bronze mirrors supported on statuettes of great beauty, as also circular mirror-cases grandly enriched with reliefs, as in Fig. 2, with its splendid steadfast face set in the midst of wavering curls. It cannot be supposed that these objects had not previously served for daily use or household adornment.

When we find large numbers of statuettes presented to the temples of the gods we are almost bound to conclude that these objects had been precious in the eyes of the donors. Many of them no doubt were images of a favourite deity, as of Athenè on the Acropolis of Athens. We can understand these having been purchased and taken direct to the temple without in any way being associated with the home life of the devotee. But there remains a vast number of bronzes found on the Acropolis and at Olympia which do not come into this category. It may be that the donors of these had usually no feeling beyond that of making a gift to the god. Still one would like to think that a large proportion of the bronzes found on the sites of temples had at one time been valued in the daily life of the people. To surrender what was most prized for the sake of future happiness was an idea familiar to the Greeks. The reader will remember the incident of Polycrates. He had been told to throw into the sea what he valued highest, and chose a ring from his finger. But apparently he had not been sufficiently sincere in his choice, because the ring was found subsequently inside a fish and brought back to him.

It is interesting and almost necessary to compare for a moment the bronze with the terra-cotta statuettes which also exist in great numbers in our museums. One would suppose that the terra-cottas must have similarly served the purpose of household adornment before being committed to the tombs, and that the same models which had been made for the bronzes would have been utilised again for the cheaper production of terra-cottas. As a matter of fact the later terra-cottas, from Tanagra and elsewhere, have little in common with the bronzes.

They reproduce only a limited number of types, such as that of a beautifully dressed woman. They ring the changes on this type indefinitely. It would almost seem as if they had been made for the women's quarters in Greek houses. At all events, in singular contrast to this limitation of the terra-cottas is the boundless variety of subject in the contemporary bronzes. It is only when we go back to older periods that we find a closer alliance between the bronzes and terra-cottas not only in the subjects they represent but even more remarkably in the style of workmanship. So much is this the case that one is tempted to believe that in the older times the same class of craftsmen who made the bronzes made also the terra-cottas. It was a simple matter to make a clay mould from a bronze statuette and then to take a cast from it in terra-cotta. The only difficulty was this, that the bronze original being in most cases highly finished down to the minutest detail, it was necessary to employ the finest possible clay in making the mould and the cast. A consequence was that this extremely fine clay became easily cracked under the process of firing. That is obvious in a number of specimens in the British Museum. It was natural that the bronze-workers who in the first instance had modelled their figures in clay, would combine with their more proper occupation the production of copies in a cheaper material.

The only exact information we possess as to the composition of ancient bronzes is derived from the analyses that have been made in modern times. No doubt Pliny gives certain statements (xxxiv. 6, 9), but they are useless when he mentions details, and only amusing where he reports that the alloy which made the Corinthian bronze so famous had been discovered at the sack of Corinth by the Romans under Mummius, when vessels of gold, silver, and bronze melted together in the conflagration and produced a golden bronze. That was in 146 B.C., whereas the charms of the gold-like Corinthian bronze had been known long before. Nevertheless, the story, though of late origin, may have been based on a tradition as to the use of gold as an alloy of bronze, because from several specimens of ancient bronzes that have been analysed it has been seen that gold and silver were actually employed. An archaic fibula yielded 7 per cent of gold, over 20 per cent of silver, and 73 per cent of copper. Another belief was that the Corinthian

bronze derived its beauty from being cooled in the water of the fountain of Peirenè.

Having given this brief introductory sketch, I may now state that my purpose in this monograph is to select only such of our statuettes as may reasonably be brought into connection with certain epochs of ancient sculpture, not altogether for the sake of the bronzes themselves, but in a greater measure because of the opportunities they afford of associating them with sculptors of renown, and of tracing the influence of Greek sculpture outside of Greece itself, as among the Etruscans or among the peoples of Gaul and Britain. In the history of Greek art much is already known of its main epochs, yet hardly a year passes without something being brought to light from Greek soil which shows how much there is still to be done in the way of a more minute analysis of artistic motives and style in the sculptures with which we have been long acquainted. In this and the next chapter I propose to consider a certain number of bronzes of the archaic period, not because of any particular artistic importance in themselves from a modern point of view, but because they help to show how the artistic mind of those early times was working its way towards a new solution of the problem of what sculpture should be. It was a critical moment for the Greeks. Their poets had already shown how the Greek language could be modulated into new forms of song, undreamt of by the older nations of antiquity, and never since surpassed. The sculptors had to take up the same parable ; and if less successful in many instances than the poets, we must remember that the methods and appliances of sculptors are not so easily changed as those of poets.

We begin with a figure which has been longer and more widely known than any other ; and the reason is this, that up to now it is the best copy in existence of a particularly famous statue. We are told that Darius, King of Persia, when he sacked the town of Miletus in 494 B.C., carried off from a neighbouring temple, long famous for its oracle, a bronze statue of Apollo, the work of a Greek sculptor, Canachos. After a lapse of nearly two centuries, when Persia had been forced to yield to the Macedonian conquest, the statue was returned to Miletus, and thereafter appears on the coinage of that town, where it is represented as an archaic statue of Apollo holding out a fawn in his right hand. Many instances are known



of statues which had become famous in one way or another, being copied on local coins ; and when it was remembered that Pliny had described the Apollo of Canachos as holding out a deer in one hand, hardly a doubt



FIG. 3.—*Bronze Statuette. Apollo of Miletus. British Museum.*

could remain that the figure on the coins of Miletus was that same Apollo. But the workmanship of the coins is too rude to be of any artistic use. At this point the statuette comes to our aid. We see at

once that it has been copied from the same original as the coin. And though much may be wanting in the spirit, as undoubtedly there is in the details, yet we may be thankful for being thus able to realise at least the pose, the proportions, and the general structure of the original.

There is, however, one difficulty that ought to be mentioned here, though it is more curious than serious. Pliny says (I quote the translation of Miss Jex-Blake, xxxiv. 75): "Kanachos made the nude Apollo which is named the Lover, and is in the temple at Didyma, of Æginetan bronze, and with it a stag so poised upon its feet that a thread can be drawn beneath them while the heel and toe alternately catch the ground, both parts working with a jointed mechanism in such a way that the impact suffices to make them spring backwards and forwards." At first sight this description seems to answer to a different type of Apollo, either the one in which the god holds a deer by the fore feet while the hind feet touch the ground, or another in which he holds out on the palm of his hand a deer standing on its feet. In both these instances some such mechanism could have been employed as that described by Pliny, and it might perhaps further be argued that the maker of the statuette, finding it difficult or unsuitable to reproduce the deer standing on its feet, had modified it as we see in the bronze. On the other hand, no such modification was necessary on the coins. It would there have been as easy to render the fawn standing on the palm of the god as lying on it, which is the case on the coins.

So far as I remember, no one has succeeded in reconciling Pliny's description with the deer lying on the palm as seen on the statuette and on the coins; and till that is done we must, I think, conclude that Pliny has mixed up two different statues of Apollo by Canachos. Now we know from another ancient writer (Pausanias, ix. 10, 2) "that Canachos had made two separate statues of Apollo, that the difference between them consisted in this, that the one was of bronze while the other was of cedar-wood, that they were identical in size and appearance, and that any person who had seen the one would not require much knowledge to recognise the other as the work of Canachos." It seems odd that Pausanias, after insisting so expressly on the identity of the two statues in all but the material of which they were made, should have added the remark, "that any person who had seen the one would not require much

knowledge to recognise the other as the work of Canachos." In the circumstances it seems to me possible that these words may contain the admission of some difference of detail, the one statue having the deer lying on the palm of the hand, the other having the deer standing on its feet on the palm of the hand, or perhaps even holding it by the fore feet while the hind feet reached the ground.

The cedar statue was to be seen in a temple close to Thebes, and was known as the Apollo Ismenios, from the river that flowed close by. The bronze statue of Miletus was called the Apollo Philesios, an epithet which Miss Jex-Blake has translated "the Lover" as others had done before. The translation may be right, but it is curious to find the one statue known by a strictly local designation, and the other, its duplicate, by so vague a title as "the Lover." One would rather expect to find under the epithet Philesios a corresponding local name.

But what was the symbolism of holding out a deer on the hand? We often see the goddess Aphrodite holding out similarly a dove, Athenè an owl, Zeus an eagle, Poseidon a dolphin or the head of a horse. In these instances the creatures held out in the hand are the symbols of the deities, just as the deer no doubt is the symbol of Apollo. It is the meaning of this action of holding out on the hand a symbolic animal that one would like to have explained. Had the sculptor merely intended to indicate Apollo, as distinguished say from Hermes, a deer at his feet would have done equally well. I suppose the holding out of it in the hand implies a greater demonstrativeness, as much as to say, "That is my favourite animal; when you see it, respect it as you do me." With the same significance Athenè and Zeus hold out with the right hand a Victory, the greatest of divine symbols.

The bow which had been held in the left hand of our figure was also a symbol of Apollo. Among other functions he was a god of the chase, to whose arrows many a stag may have fallen. We must be careful, however, not to imagine that the fawn in his right hand has been introduced by the sculptor to indicate the trophies of Apollo. The creature is too small and insignificant for that. Something different must have been intended. The tiny form would indicate the class of creatures which Apollo protected till such times as they were fit to look after themselves against the far-reaching bow. Yet even with this explanation,

one feels that there is something not altogether as could be wished in the juxtaposition of the fawn and the deadly bow.

Cicero, with an air of deprecation for those who, like himself, valued such minor things as works of art, says, "Who of us does not know that the statues of Canachos are too rigid to be true to nature?" The remark applies perfectly to our statuette, which is plainly too rigid to be true to nature. Yet we may wish that Cicero had gone more into particulars, and left us a detailed criticism which we could have understood. But his remark is at least the testimony of one of the greatest men in the world's history to the effect that Canachos, whatever his faults, was one of the sculptors of Greece whose works were worthy of study. It was easy for Cicero as for us to point to the rigidity of such figures as the Apollo. But we have to bear in mind that every age has its limitations, whether conscious of them or not, and that in the age of Canachos these limitations prescribed that a statue, even when meant to be in repose, could not be rendered except as strained throughout every limb. Public taste would have revolted against anything else. If one could imagine—what of course is an impossibility—a sculptor of those days producing a statue with all the freedom of movement of the Apollo Belvedere, I suppose it would have been received with shouts of derision, as befitting the work of an artist two centuries in advance of his time. The taste of the age abhorred everything that was not precise, more or less formal, and always gracious to look upon according to its own standard. So much so, that one wonders how a great sculptor could express himself within such limitations, but that is because we exaggerate what seems to us artistic fetters and hindrances, forgetting that to those early sculptors, unconscious of such hindrances, every new step in advance must have appeared an inspiration of infinitely greater moment than we can now realise—looking back as we do, while they looked forward.

From these considerations we turn again to the Museum statuette, remarking that if it be compared with others of about the same date it will be seen that it has a distinction of its own which alone would mark it off as a copy from a celebrated statue. The elaborate way in which the hair is arranged in two rows of curls over the brow is not what one would expect in a statuette. It will be observed that they project in a very prominent manner, so much so that if this projection



were proportionately increased in a life-sized statue the effect would be ridiculous. The inference seems to be that in the original statue this manner of wearing the hair had been a conspicuous feature which the copyist had determined to preserve at all costs.

The shortness and slightness of the thighs in comparison with the lower part of the legs give the statuette a singularly ungainly appearance. We cannot charge so glaring a fault to Canachos, with all his rigidity of pose; but we can imagine a copyist of later date missing by just a little a system of proportions which he no longer understood.

To what date, then, are we to assign the bronze statuette? Was it copied from the statue before it was carried off to Persia by Darius, or was it made after the statue was restored to Miletus in the third century B.C.? I am inclined to the latter alternative not only for the reasons already given, but also because in the rendering of the bodily forms there is a remarkable softening down and rounding off where in true archaic work we see the forms of bones and muscles sharply and strongly defined. The return of the statue in the third century was, as we have seen, the occasion of introducing representations of it on the coins of Miletus, and we may reasonably conclude that the public rejoicing had led also to the production of statuettes of the famous Apollo, copied as exactly as was possible in a later age. It may be asked, "If all these allowances have to be made for the copyist, what remains of the original of Canachos?" There remains this, that however much the copyist may have varied from the original to its detriment, yet the bronze statuette stands out conspicuously among its contemporaries as a copy of a great statue, and that up to now it is the only thing we can turn to with any confidence when we read in ancient writers of the fame of Canachos.

The statuette of Victory (Fig. 4) to which I next call attention is by itself an interesting example of archaic sculpture in the sixth century B.C. Though worked in the round, the figure is practically a relief. The wide-spreading wings with their close-lying pinions, the fine flat folds of the drapery, and the sideward movement of the goddess, have all been thought out on the archaic principles of relief such as prevailed in the sixth century. The swiftness of her movement is clearly and decisively expressed in the upper folds of the dress and in the long tresses of hair which are dashed backward in her speed, but still it is all in the manner of a relief, and that

is not surprising when we remember to what extent the energies of early Greek sculptors had been devoted to relief in bronze. What the object may be which she holds in the fingers of her right hand has not been explained. Nothing of the kind occurs in the Victories of subsequent art. But we must be prepared to expect small difficulties of that sort when we recollect that at the time with which we are at present concerned, both art and poetry abounded in winged female figures, which served to the Greek mind as personifications of many different powers, such as fate, strife, and so on ; the one seldom distinguished from the other except by some slight emblem. In time these numerous personifications became consolidated, so to speak, in the figure of Nikè or Victory ; and we can hardly be far wrong, though as yet we cannot explain the object in the right hand, in identifying our bronze as a Nikè.

In the art of the great age it was usual to give Victory a pose as if flying with her wings raised almost upright from the shoulders, and in many of these instances we see how magnificently the wings of a great bird may be combined with the human form. The splendid curve of the wing, just where it springs from the body of the bird, is, I suppose, unrivalled in nature as an indication of physical power. In that great age the wings of Nikè had become accepted as facts, and sculptors were free to use them in accordance with their own knowledge or observation of the actual wings or flight of a great bird.

But in the archaic age of the sixth century B.C. the wings of Victory were mainly accepted as mere auxiliaries to her speed. She might even have wings to her heels as well as to her shoulders. The one thing to attain was swiftness. Her movement is generally in a horizontal direction, and may be described as running with the imaginary help of wings. Apparently the artists had no intention of trying to reconcile the action of these figures with the natural movement of a bird beyond that of spreading the wings sideways. Truth of that kind was of less importance to them than the beauty of the wings themselves, with their long sweeping lines enclosing narrow, flat surfaces which lie contiguously, and appealed irresistibly in an early stage of art, when artists did not care for more truth to Nature than what was necessary for the moment.

Another delight of those early sculptors was in the contrasts which they found, or established, between the more or less horizontal lines of

the wings and the vertical lines of the drapery as seen in the bronze. The effect was one of balance and stability as against the rapid movement of the figure. There was the contrast also between the feathers of the wings, rigid and flat by nature, and the folds of the dress where they are thrown into irregularity by the accident of movement. There was the contrast also of nude forms as against drapery and wings. I have pointed to these contrasts, not because it is necessary to emphasise the value



FIG. 4.—*Archaic Bronze Victory. British Museum.*

and importance of them at all times, but specially because in the older arts of Egypt and Assyria nothing of the kind had been recognised to any extent ; because the Greeks were the first to indicate the supreme importance of such things, and because in our statuette the separate values of wings, drapery, and nude forms have obviously been the subject of anxious consideration.

In archaic sculpture of the sixth century B.C. we have often occasion to notice the habit of lifting the skirt a little. It was the fashion then

for women to wear long dresses falling to the ground in many fine folds, especially on public occasions when they went to attend ceremonies in the temples. Ordinary prudence would suggest lifting the skirt from the ground. But we see this action frequently also in figures which are standing placidly. It is almost always only a slight movement, just enough to throw the otherwise vertical and straight folds into becoming disorder. Most probably the effect was fully appreciated by the women themselves. It was certainly seized on eagerly by the artists of the time. Even in our bronze statuette it is retained as we see by the action of the left hand, although this action was hardly necessary in her case when the agitated movement of the figure was of itself sufficient to furnish any amount of disorder in the folds of the dress. But force of habit was strong. Force of habit was also answerable for the manner in which the drapery is made to descend to the pedestal in a large broad mass. In a marble figure we can readily understand how that would have been necessary or advisable for strength and security. But in a bronze that hardly needed to be thought of, and cannot well be accounted for except from the influence of sculpture in marble. But apart from this we know, from a number of winged bronze figures found some years ago on the Acropolis of Athens, how firmly established in archaic art had been this custom of making the drapery descend to the pedestal in a broad mass. The upper folds of drapery which, like her tresses, are being driven backward by the force of her movement are, of course, thinner and lighter than the heavy mass of the skirt, and therefore much more susceptible to movement. That the artist has observed this very well must stand to his credit, considering how seldom observations of this kind occur in the art of his time.

In Greek legend we read that the first sculptor Daidalos had fashioned a pair of wings for his son Icaros, who, having soared aloft gaily for a space, at last reached a point where the artificial wings gave way, whereupon he fell headlong into the sea. If we may judge from ancient representations, the wings of Icaros are supposed to have been attached to his arms at the shoulders and wrists, much in the manner of the right arm and wing of our bronze, and in accordance with the general rule of figures of this class. The exceptions are few where the wings start in the front of the body as if springing from the chest bones, though it must be



allowed that the effect so produced conveys a much more obvious resemblance to a bird, and therefore a more appropriate application of wings to the human form than in the other case, where the wings spring from the shoulder-blades and appear like auxiliaries fitted to the arms.

Another curious exception is that of Hypnos, the god of sleep, of



FIG. 5.—*Marble Victory by Archermos. Athens.*

whom there are several ancient representations in existence, in particular a beautiful bronze head in the British Museum, all alike going back to some famous original apparently of the time of Praxiteles if not actually by him (Plate II.). The wings start from the temples, and we know that in this instance the wings are those of a night-bird, such as an owl, which travels without noise or sound. We know further that Hypnos on one occasion was ordered to take the form of some such night-bird

and to pipe from a tree till he put to sleep Zeus, the father of gods and men. But we have no explanation as to why the wings of Hypnos should start from his temples. When we see a pair of wings springing from the hair of Hermes, the messenger of the gods, we accept them as representing the winged cap or petasus which he usually wore, and as indicating either the speed or the silence with which he travelled. Hypnos had no occasion for speed. It was silence that was his gift, and silence after all is the best inducement to sleep. Among mankind it is, as has been remarked, a general habit, in lying down to sleep, to rest the temples on the hollow of the hand. There is probably some good physiological reason for so universal a practice. But it is enough for our purpose that ancient artists had observed this habit. The next step would be to assign the temples as specially the seat of sleep, and to attach to them the silently moving wings of a night-bird.

So far we have said nothing of what is perhaps the most interesting feature of our statuette of Victory, its relation to a marble statue found some years ago in the island of Delos, and now in the museum at Athens, along with its pedestal, on which is inscribed the name and genealogy of its sculptor, Archermos of Chios (Fig. 5). Had the Delos statue been found without its inscribed pedestal, we should probably have thought little more of it than of other archaic statues of the same general character, and certainly no one would have attempted to associate it with the famous name of Archermos, so little do we comprehend, as I have already said, the importance which attached in early times to every new advance in art, however slight it may seem to us now. We should have recognised that the Delos statue belonged to an age of transition from working in bronze to working in marble. The rendering of the hair over the forehead in formal wavy lines would have told us of the surviving influence of bronze, while in the rest of the figure the simplicity of the forms and their structural character would have made it clear that a new era of sculpture had dawned with the introduction of marble.

The inscription on the pedestal, stripped of its poetic form, says that the statue was the work of Archermos, son of Mikkiades of the island of Chios. Its importance lies in its obvious connection with a passage of Pliny, where that writer gives with unusual detail and with much circumstance an account of the early school of sculptors in marble in Chios,

formed by successive generations of one and the same family, of whom the best known were Mikkiades, Archermos, and the two sons of Archermos, Bupalos and Athenis, whose sculptures, it was said, had brought more celebrity to Chios than all its vines. Among the places where their works were to be seen, outside of their native island, was Delos, where the marble Nikè was found. Pliny was too much occupied with the romantic element in the lives of these sculptors to furnish a list of their works. But we learn from another ancient writer not only that Archermos did make a figure of Nikè, but also that he was the first to give her wings.

The finding of another pedestal inscribed with the name of Archermos, on the Acropolis at Athens, does not necessarily prove anything more than that a statue by him had found its way to that most critical of cities, but it has suggested—the suggestion is now generally accepted—that those beautiful archaic marble statues of women still to be seen on the Acropolis were the work of his immediate descendants. If that is ever shown to be true, it will then be possible to appreciate the extraordinary attraction which this new phase of sculpture in marble had created, and how much was due to the Chian school.

## II

### *Archaic Etruscan Statuettes*

It is not many years ago yet since all archaic bronze statuettes were regarded as Etruscan. Most of them that were to be seen in museums had been found in Etruria, or at all events in Italy, while as to the few which had unquestionably come from Greece, the answer might have been heard, that they must have been imported into Greece from Etruria. An ancient authority<sup>1</sup> told that the Etruscan sculptors' work (*signa Tuscanica*) had found its way everywhere. In Greek literature the references were many that testified to the admiration in which Etruscan metal work, such as candelabra, vases, and armour, were held by the Greeks.<sup>2</sup> There the question stood. Nothing more was to be said till the time came for active exploration in Greece itself. One excavation after another brought to light numbers of archaic bronze statuettes, till at last it began to be asked whether, in fact, not a few of the archaic bronzes found in Etruria itself had not been imported there from Greece. That was turning the tables with a vengeance. A lively division of opinion ensued : either the Etruscans had no artistic originality, and were mere imitators of the Greeks ; or they had distinct artistic gifts of their own, while subject to the influence of the contemporary Greeks. In these circumstances, the first thing we have to do is, to learn to discriminate such

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, xxxiv. 34, "*Signa . . . Tuscanica per terras dispersa quae in Etruria factitata non est dubium.*"

<sup>2</sup> As regards candelabra, see Athenaios, xv. 700, *τίς τῶν λυχνείων ἡ ἐργασία : Τυρρηνική*, and compare *ibid.* i. 28<sup>b</sup>, where a Greek poet, assigning to various nationalities the particular thing for which each was most famous, as, for instance, the Phœnicians for the invention of letters, the Carians for their ships, and the Athenians for their pottery, awards to the Etruscans supremacy in all kinds of bronze work useful and ornamental in a house.

differences of style and execution as distinguish the archaic Etruscan from the contemporary archaic Greek statuettes.

We begin with two specimens which will serve to illustrate the archaic Greek manner of rendering nude male figures, and at the same time show us what sort of progress was made within the archaic period itself. In each of these figures it will be observed that the principal aim of the artist was to secure accuracy in the bodily forms from the point of view of an observer, by whom each detail was regarded as almost a separate entity. As a consequence the particularising of bodily forms, which ought to be of secondary effect, such as the structure of the bones, inevitably led to a formal, almost conventional, manner of rendering them, which had a certain beauty of its own, such as will be seen in the first figure (Fig. 6).

In the second figure (Fig. 7) there is a marked change. The anatomical forms are strongly expressed, even more strongly, in fact, than they ought to be, but formality and conventionalism had largely given way under a new impulse to express, if possible, something of the inner force of organic human life. It must have been just about this time that the Greek sculptor Antenor appeared upon the scene—he who made for the Athenians a bronze group of the Tyrannicides, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, in the act of slaying the tyrant Hipparchos in the streets of Athens. We are told that during the brief period when the Persian king, Xerxes, held possession of Athens, he carried off that group, that subsequently a copy of it was made by two sculptors working conjointly, and that finally, after the conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great, the original group was restored to Athens. After its restoration this group was copied in works of minor art, as on coins and painted vases, apparently from mere joy at the fact of its restoration. By themselves these copies have little worth, but they have enabled archæologists to identify two marble statues in the museum of Naples as more or less faithful copies of the original group.



FIG. 6.  
*Archaic Greek Bronze.*  
*British Museum.*



These statues are known from ancient copies, and as regards one of them we may very confidently say that no better comparison for it could be found than our bronze statuette. The type of head is different to some degree, and the action of the figure is not quite the same.



FIG. 7.—*Archaic Greek Bronze. British Museum.*

Yet in both figures we have a striking similarity even in conception, still more in the rendering of the bodily forms. There can be no doubt for a moment that our bronze belongs to exactly the period at which Antenor made his famous group of the two Tyrannicides. It tells precisely the same story of the first efforts of Athenian sculptors to break

away from the conventionalisms of older times and to seek gradually a new sphere in the rendering of an inner organic vitality. No one can say that Antenor was the first to strike out on this new path. Others of his contemporaries may equally have been searching in the same direction. That is quite possible. But we have to remember also that the task assigned him in making a group of the two Tyrannicides was one which could not but have stirred in him a deep and strong emotion. The children in the streets of Athens were then singing a rude ballad of how Harmodios and Aristogeiton, concealing their daggers in branches of myrtle as they marched in public procession, found an opportunity of stabbing to the heart the man who had not only wronged them personally, but was an evil to the state. How deeply the people were moved by the event may be gathered from the song of the children, which has survived till now. In such circumstances, the sculptor, who accepted a public commission to celebrate that first great step towards freedom, would naturally be in full sympathy with the popular movement, and likely to strain every fibre of his being towards infusing into his group something of the new life of freedom which had just dawned on Athens.

In the last stage of archaic art, the conventionalisms and vigour, both of them very assertive in the first and second stages, give place to an idealising of the bodily forms which in the next generation was to lead to the school of Pheidias. Simplicity and largeness of manner are diffused through the several principal divisions of the figure, but not through the figure as a whole. That last touch was still wanting, as in Pygmalion's statue, before the goddess had breathed life into it. It is curious how the Greeks delighted to fable the breathing of life into statues. Another instance was that of Pandora, a statue turned alive by the breath of Athenè. Again it was Athenè, the goddess of handicraft and intelligence, who gave life to the figure of a man made by Prometheus. And we perceive something of the same turn of thought when we read of statues by Daidalos having to be fastened lest they should run away. These stories were the invention of a primitive legend-making age. Yet somehow they impress us as if the art instincts of the Greeks had from the beginning observed that a statue, however accurate externally, must have part of the sculptor's own life within it.

Let us now take three Etruscan statuettes of a corresponding date,

and more or less akin in subject. The first (Fig. 8), which is also the most archaic of them, represents a nude male figure carrying a calf on his shoulder. It is a type with which we are familiar in archaic Greek sculpture from a marble statue on the Acropolis of Athens. A more common variant shows us a ram instead of a calf. Sometimes the figure is expressly indicated as the god Hermes, in which case we recognise him as Hermes Criophoros or ram-bearer, a character in which he is said to have once appeared mysteriously in the town of Tanagra at a time of pestilence, with the result that the plague ceased, to commemorate which happy issue the sculptor Calamis was employed to make a statue of the god as a Criophoros.



FIG. 8.  
*Archaic Etruscan Statuette.  
Man carrying a Calf.  
British Museum.*

There is no doubt, however, that the artistic type of a man carrying a calf or ram on his shoulders had been familiar long before in Greek sculpture, and there is equally, I think, no doubt that the Etruscan who made our statuette had derived his idea from the Greeks. But he had not derived more than the general idea. He has no sense of proportion such as the Greek of that time possessed. He exaggerates not only the size of the calf but the effect of its weight in pressing downwards the head of the figure. Neither of these things is to be seen in the contemporary Greek statue on the Acropolis of Athens. In the face of the bronze much attention is given to minute details, as if it were there

—in the face—principally that the key to the action was to be found. Consistently with this view everything is eliminated from the bodily forms which was not absolutely necessary to convey the general impression.

We may now take a more advanced specimen (Fig. 9)—a figure of Heracles which was found in the Lake of Falterona in Etruria along with a number of highly interesting bronzes now in the Museum. It will be seen that it is almost a direct challenge to the second of our Greek statuettes, each in its way being an exhibition of how robust the human figure may be. But a moment's comparison will show that the robustness of the Etruscan



statuette has been attained to a large extent by the sacrifice of exactness and precision in the details of the bodily forms and by an extraordinary degree of exaggeration. The sculptor was not ignorant of the archaic rules and conventions of his time in regard to proportions and the defining of the separate parts of the human form. We can see that all over the figure. But he could not resist the impulse towards forcible and exaggerated expression, such as is seen perhaps most plainly in the gigantic knot into which the lion's skin is fastened on the breast of Heracles. The body is thrust forward as if swelling with life. The head is turned violently to the side, the features much exaggerated. The whole figure is an instance of breaking away from traditional canons of art without being able as yet to substitute another but equally inflexible set of rules.

A more agreeable effect is produced by our third figure (Fig. 10)—a young man holding in his hand a sword, the blade of which has been broken off. In his limbs and bodily forms there is a youth-



FIG. 9.—*Etruscan Heracles. British Museum.*

ful sensitiveness which recalls the Greeks of the best days. But having got over this first impression, we cannot disguise the fact that his arms are in size out of all proportion, that the chlamys is fastened round his neck with a studied effect quite foreign to the Greek spirit, and that the face is animated to an exceptional extent. In the face, the hair, and the drapery, which last presents an agreeable contrast to the nude forms, there

is much to be admired over and above the general attractions of the bronze. Yet after all there remains something essentially Etruscan in the figure, and that something is exaggeration.

We have not yet considered what an ordinary draped female figure looked like in the archaic age of Greece. Let us take as an example a bronze statuette in the British Museum which stands on its ancient pedestal and wants nothing but the right hand (Plate I.). Most probably that hand had held a flower. There was much of exquisiteness among the Greek women of those days. Satisfied with their own beauty and the perfection of their dress, they liked to dally with a flower in the hand as if a flower were obviously the one thing best suited for them. Our statuette ranges admirably with the series of archaic marble statues on the Acropolis of Athens—the same dress with its multitude of fine folds relieved by richly ornamented borders, and above all the same modest satisfaction as regards dress and demeanour. If our bronze differs from them, the difference lies chiefly in its more advanced type of face. The expression of self-consciousness in the marble statues has given way to a larger and more ideal conception in the bronze.

Our next step is to find an Etruscan statuette of about the same period, and presenting much the same opportunities for the treatment of drapery and for the general expression. In the example before us (Fig. 11) it will be observed that the drapery, as in the Greek statuette, consists of two garments, an under chiton which shows on the breast and right shoulder, as also at the feet, and an upper himation which envelops the figure, passing over the left shoulder. But the folds of this upper himation are indicated with much greater freedom and greater attention to natural effect than in the Greek bronze, which very probably is due to the influence of a somewhat later stage of art. The massive fold which runs diagonally from the left shoulder across the body is quite different in form from anything in Greek sculpture. For one thing it is much ruder, and for another the pattern of circles incised upon it appears on the outside of the fold at one part and on the inside at another. Similarly, where the inner edge of the himation is turned outwards beside the right arm the same pattern again appears as if the himation had been enriched with an identical border both inside and out. That is what the Greeks never did ; and certainly

no Greek would ever have destroyed the massive diagonal fold across the body with an ornamental pattern, for the very simple reason that it is a large fold and not a border.



FIG. 10.—*Archaic Etruscan Bronze. British Museum.*

On the archaic marble statues of the Acropolis we frequently see a crown on the head richly decorated with painted floral patterns. It is a crown identical in shape with that of the Etruscan statuette, but instead of standing out conspicuously, not to say boastfully, as in the Etruscan

bronze, it is invariably kept down to the most modest and unobtrusive dimensions. That was not to the Etruscan taste. Their love of conspicuousness is seen also in the massive necklace of the bronze and particularly in the intensified features of the face. Yet we are bound to acknowledge that in this figure the workmanship is often excellent. But for an innate habit of exaggeration, the sculptor might perhaps have stood side by side with the Greeks of his day.

The problem which we stated at the beginning, and have thus far endeavoured to illustrate by contemporary examples from Greece and from Etruria, is one that cannot be solved from the statuettes alone. We must look farther afield. We must allow, for instance, that there were some things that the Etruscans could do almost as well as the Greeks in the archaic age ; one was the engraving of gems, and another the production of gold jewellery. On the other hand, there were things where they failed badly, and there is one branch of the minor arts in which their failure is very easily demonstrated—the painting of vases. Every one knows that most of the Greek vases in our museums have been found in Etruscan tombs. They had been imported from Greece by wealthy Etruscans, and it is a testimony to the good taste of these Etruscans that they chose the very finest specimens they could get hold of. Their own workmen were by no means ignorant of the technical processes in use in the making of vases. Yet somehow their attempts to imitate the Greeks are melancholy failures. That is surely a reproach to a people renowned for their skill in terra-cotta work. One speculates in vain as to the cause. It is not enough to remember how the love of beautiful painted vases had distinguished the Greeks from the highly civilised nations of the East, and to assume that this same distinguishing quality was likely to hold good also as against the nations of the West such as the Etruscans, because we know how the Etruscans admired and coveted these products of Greek genius, and how direct and intimate were their relations with the Greeks. There must have been some radical difference in the artistic instincts of the two peoples.

One would suppose that the faculty of incising designs on bronze was practically the same as drawing with a fine brush on a terra-cotta vase. In each case success depends entirely on beauty of line. Is it not, therefore, strange that the Etruscans, who had shrunk from the attempt



at vase-painting, should have devoted themselves to an extraordinary extent to the production of incised drawings on bronze? The explanation may lie partly in this, that it is one thing to execute a drawing on a flat even surface, such as the bronze mirrors and cistæ of the Etruscans,



FIG. 11.—*Archaic Etruscan Statuette. British Museum.*

and a much more difficult thing to accommodate a drawing to a surface which curves both vertically and horizontally, as is the case with many of the Greek vases. Very probably it was to escape this difficulty that the Etruscans abandoned the painting of vases and threw their energies into drawing on flat bronze surfaces instead, leaving us a vast series of such

drawings out of all comparison with the few specimens which have survived from the Greeks.

We must remember that the Etruscans were never successful in working with the brush on a small scale. In archaic times they could paint very well on a large scale, as the frescoes testify which still survive on the walls of their tombs. Then again it may be argued that having acquired, by means of their skill in bronze-work, a success which had extended even to Greece, they would naturally not care to profit by the example of the Greek vases further than was suitable for their own special craft. For example, on the Greek vases the finest drawing occurs on the circular kylikes, where the curving surfaces of the exterior present the greatest possible difficulties for the draughtsman. The best of the Greek vase-painters revelled in covering these surfaces with drawings of singular beauty. Whether an Etruscan would have ever succeeded in translating drawing of that kind to a bronze vase of the same shape is a question we need not discuss. On the other hand, these Greek kylikes have in the interior a circular space which contains a drawing of one or more figures. This was exactly what the Etruscan required for his circular bronze mirrors, and it is here that a comparison ought to be made between him and the Greek vase-painter, each on his own ground. I do not say that the result would indicate a very extensive indebtedness of the Etruscans to the Greeks, but it would confirm the view just set forth that they had in their own way profited by the vase-painting of the Greeks.

Here are two of their archaic mirrors with incised designs; the one (Fig. 12) is a youth, with widespread wings to his shoulders and wings to his shoes, moving with great strides, and carrying a lyre in one hand. One might say, here is instance of pure Greek drawing, so finely conceived is this youthful figure, so essentially Greek his action of holding up a flower. His body outlined against the background of the spreading wings, and these wings elaborately delineated as a foil to the simple lines of the body, the face of a large, full type—these are characteristics singularly Greek. Yet the drawing is Etruscan. For instance, one cannot imagine a Greek leaving out the lines which should have indicated the bones of the chest, and indeed almost the whole of the inner markings proper to a figure in this movement. Yet these lines have been purposely omitted for the sake

of a particular effect of contrast with the wings. Again, one cannot believe that a Greek would ever have reconciled himself to so specially decorative a treatment of the wings, whereas that is just one of those things that fit in with the tendency towards exaggeration which we saw in the Etruscan statuettes. The movement of the figure, the spreading of the wings, and the winged shoes would be suitable for the Greek hero Perseus, such as



FIG. 12.—*Etruscan Mirror. British Museum.*

we see him on archaic Greek vases, and it is possible that so far the figure has been based on Perseus. But apart from the identification of the figure on the mirror, I think we have already seen enough to recognise in it a striking combination of the influence of Greek drawing and Etruscan individuality.

On the other mirror (Fig. 13), the central figure is again one of those much-winged beings of archaic art—Greek as well as Etruscan. The peculiarity in this instance is that the wings spring from her waist and not



from the shoulders, which is perhaps just as natural, and may be regarded as a variant on those archaic Greek figures where the wings spring from the chest. The wings on her shoes are much exaggerated in size. Equally exaggerated is the action of holding out the skirt with the right hand, and



FIG. 13.—*Archaic Etruscan Mirror. British Museum.*

yet the series of long narrow folds formed thereby is quite attractive in its way. It is a curious action, that of the left hand raised over the shoulder to take hold of, or receive, something which the boy behind her appears to hold up. It is curious, because of its representing an action still going on, in contrast to the completed action shown in the holding of the skirt, the position of the wings, and the general attitude of the figure. I have



spoken of a boy standing behind her. It is, however, possible that this and the other figure in front are not boys, but men represented on a diminutive scale, as was usual, among the Greeks at least, when they wished to indicate mortals in presence of a deity. Of that there is an abundance of examples on the Greek reliefs, and this is the more likely to be the true interpretation because the raising of the arms of the two diminutive figures is peculiarly the action of adorantes or suppliants. The myrtle branch which one of them holds is also appropriate to a suppliant. The central figure would then be a goddess, and as such a being of commanding stature. The conception is quite in accord with the religious feelings of the Greeks, and no doubt it was from them that the Etruscan artist got his inspiration. Figures bearing a strong general resemblance both to the goddess and to the suppliants are to be found on contemporary Greek vases. But on the vases there is always an entire absence of that element of exaggeration which we associate with the individuality of the Etruscans, and find in the mirror before us. The Etruscans took a special pride in their shoes. If they wore nothing else they had always their shoes on, in contrast to the bare-footedness which the Greeks loved. The two suppliants wear the usual pointed shoes and nothing else. I suppose we may take it as a mere slip of the engraver that there is no sign of drapery on the body of the goddess. We cannot suppose that her dress begins only at the waist, nor that the upper part of it had been omitted for the sake of some effect of contrast between nude and draped forms. Or if that was the case, then the idea was certainly not borrowed from the Greeks.

It is very exceptional to find a bronze mirror with a relief sculptured in the back, as in Fig. 14, instead of the usual incised design. Possibly the idea had been to combine on the mirror itself the relief which more properly belonged to the case. A Greek would hardly have thought of such a thing. Again, the subject in this instance is clearly derived from the well-known Greek conception of Peleus carrying off Thetis. But the Etruscan artist has changed Peleus into Heracles and inscribed the name of Heracles beside him. But apart from this licence, we must allow that he runs the archaic Greek sculptors very close in his treatment of bas-relief as suitable to a small bronze mirror, with its flatness of surfaces and rich flow of lines.

As early as the seventh century B.C. the Etruscans were celebrated for their work in terra-cotta.<sup>1</sup> Even in Rome the old temples were full of such works by them, and when in the course of time the Romans lost taste for these simple archaic terra-cotta statues, they did not escape the rebuke of Cato,<sup>2</sup> who told them that they might well be content with what had pleased their ancestors. On the outsides of the temples were cornices richly decorated with antefixæ modelled in terra-cotta, such as may be seen among the remains of an archaic Tuscan temple in the Museum. The pediments were surmounted by figures or groups, as was the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol with its chariot of four horses raised on the highest point. That was the famous terra-cotta quadriga which the Romans had captured at Veii at the close of their ten years' siege.

In Greece there was in early times a similar centre of terra-cotta sculpture in the town of Corinth. The Corinthians were an enterprising as well as an artistic people. Their enterprise called their ships westward along the Gulf of Corinth. They planted a colony in Corfu, and they were concerned in the early settlements of Greeks as far west as Sicily and Magna Græcia. It is easy to imagine that their intercourse had extended also to Etruria. But there is no need to imagine this if we accept as a fact the ancient tradition that in the seventh century B.C. certain artist modellers in terra-cotta from Corinth had settled among the Etruscans, and had there introduced their art (Pliny, xxxv. 152). There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of this tradition, or to assume that it had been invented by the Greeks as a sort of claim of superiority or precedence on their part over the Etruscans, because the story is not told primarily in connection with these artists. *They* only come in incidentally as having accompanied in his exile from Corinth Damaratos from whom descended Tarquin, the King of Rome. Artists do not usually expatriate themselves among barbarians. When they leave their home they look forward to some favourable opportunity of cultivating their art and prospering in it, and on that principle we may fairly suppose that these Corinthian workers in terra-cotta had been aware before they started that in Etruria they would find their particular branch of art already being practised and received with favour.

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, xxxv. 157, "Elaboratam hanc artem Italiae et maxime Etruriae."

<sup>2</sup> Livy, xxxiv. 4, 4.



FIG. 14.—*Bronze Etruscan Mirror with relief: Heracles carrying off a Woman.*  
*Archaic—Sixth Century B.C. British Museum.*





In relating this tradition of the Corinthian artists, Pliny adds that in the opinion of some the art of modelling had been practised long before that time in the island of Samos, which lies close to the western coast of Asia Minor. At present there is every reason to accept this ancient belief as well founded. Every year brings fresh evidence in its favour.

We cannot any longer overlook a belief prevalent among the Etruscans themselves that their ancestors had originally come from Asia Minor. In support of that belief we may adduce this strong bent of theirs towards sculpture in terra-cotta. But the most we can be quite confident about is that in early historical times Corinth had stood in close relationship with Samos and Asia Minor in the East and with Etruria in the West, that Corinth had learned much of the art of working in terra-cotta from Asia Minor, and had passed this knowledge on to the Etruscans. For the present it must remain only a possibility that the artistic instincts of the Etruscans had come to them from an original community of race with the Greeks of Asia Minor, and that the aptness with which in later times they helped themselves to all they wanted from the art of Greece proper, was due also to that same community of origin. I think this is the view which will more and more assert itself in regard to the Etruscans as an artistic people.

Towards the end of the seventh century B.C. the history of Asia Minor is fascinating in the highest degree. New forms of verse and song burst into being. The arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture were never richer or more varied. How intense had been the artistic activity of these times may be gathered from the splendid poetic remains of Archilochus, Sappho, Alcæus, to take only the best names. The discoveries of recent years are beginning to enable us to realise what we had only heard of in tradition, that the first great home of Greek painting had been in Asia Minor. In sculpture of the archaic period we are fortunately rich, and in architecture we can already judge—for example, from the remains of the archaic temple at Ephesus—how beautifully varied and luxuriant had been the details of the old Ionic temples in their original home. How different those columns with their sculptured bases, their capitals varying as if no two ought to be strictly alike, their elaborately carved neckings, and in short the apparently interminable variety of details under a general similarity of aspect—how different all

this opulence of forms from the Ionic temples of Greece proper with their precision of details and their passionate search after an established rule as to what was the most beautiful. In vase-painting, where so much of the charm depended on refinements of drawing and so little comparatively on grandeur of conception or splendour of effect, it is remarkable that in Asia Minor as yet hardly a trace of that art has been discovered. Compare with this the fact that most of the great painters from Polygnotos to Apelles were natives of Asia Minor, and largely practised their art there.

On comparing the oratory of the Athenians with that of Asia Minor, Quintilian, one of the most observant of Roman writers in matters of Art, contrasts the simplicity and politeness of the Athenians with the extravagance of the Asian orators, as he calls them. Some were of opinion, he says, that the inflated redundant style of speaking common among these latter was due to the non-Greek element in the population.

In their inscriptions the Etruscans employed the Greek alphabet, and apparently had never used any other. They must have known much more of the Greek language than its alphabet, because in the very large series of bronze mirrors and engraved gems which they have left us, we constantly come upon scenes from Greek mythology which could hardly have been intelligible to them without a fair knowledge of Greek literature. We cannot well suppose that they knew these myths solely from Greek works of art, say from the painted vases, because in that case one would expect them to merely copy what they saw. But this is not the case. On the mirrors they constantly inscribe the names of the figures, and it is noticeable that these names, though written in Greek characters, do not present a pure Greek form. They more nearly resemble the Latin, as for instance, *Menerfa*, which is equal to *Minerva*, instead of *Athenè* the Greek name of the goddess. The Greek *Bellerophon* becomes *Melerpanta*, and so on in almost innumerable examples. Surely this debasing of Greek names, if we may call it so, is itself proof that the Etruscans had been acquainted with Greek myths and legends long before these myths and legends had reached them under artistic forms. One might be justified in going so far as to say that the absence of Etruscan writing, except in the inscriptions, which is so remarkable a phenomenon in a people renowned for their art and their civilisation



generally, could be accounted for by assuming that the literature ordinarily current among them had been Greek.

I have only attempted to illustrate in a general way the differences between the Etruscans and the Greeks from an artistic point of view. But it will be found that the descendants of those old Etruscans displayed much the same artistic spirit when many centuries later they formed the famous Tuscan schools of painting and sculpture.

### III

#### *Statuettes of the Age of Polycleitos and Myron*

THERE was a saying among the ancient Greeks that certain of their artists had represented men as they ought to be, others as they were, and some worse than they were. The saying was applied to sculptors, painters, and poets alike. It was not a mere passing observation which from its epigrammatic form had caught the public ear, for we find no less a writer than Aristotle employing it on several occasions. But what concerns us for the moment is that the Roman writer Quintilian seems to have had this formula in his mind when speaking of the sculptor Polycleitos. He says : " Polycleitos surpassed the other sculptors in careful study and in gracefulness, but although in general he bears off the palm, yet it is thought that he had one defect, that of not being able to give gravity or importance to his figures. For just as he added grace and charm to the human form, so also in his figures of deities he seems to have failed in attaining the full measure of their grandeur. He is even said to have avoided figures of mature age and dignity, not daring to go beyond beardless youth. It is said that Lysippos and Praxiteles approached most nearly to the truth of nature."

From other ancient sources we know that one of the services of Polycleitos was that he had worked out for the use of sculptors a set of rules, which the Greeks called a canon, for the construction of the human figure. But a set of rules or system of proportions can only be of use to artists if it is based on a wide generalisation and on a multitude of observations and measurements of men as they are. If that was the method employed by Polycleitos, we can understand how critics came to speak of him as having made men better than they were, or as having gone beyond the exact truth of nature.

A characteristic of almost every one of his statues was, we read in an ancient writer, that it stood resting its weight on one leg, as in the Diadumenos for example (*uno crure insistere*). At first sight this does not seem any great innovation, because among bronze statuettes older



FIG. 15.—Marble Statue. *Diadumenos of Vaison.*  
*British Museum.*



FIG. 16.—Marble Statue. *Diadumenos Farnese.* *British Museum.*

than his time we occasionally find a close approach to this attitude. I think that the true significance of his innovation can only be fully realised when, taking as an illustration of it the Diadumenos, we observe how, by means of the raised arms, the whole figure is thrown into a momentary poise which at once arrests the attention.

Of the Diadumenos, or youth binding round his hair a diadem won

in athletic games, several ancient copies exist in marble. But the one which is generally accepted as most true to the original of Polycleitos—which was of bronze—is a marble statue in the British Museum found at Vaison in France, and not pretending to be other than a copy made in Roman times (Fig. 15). Lately another marble statue has been obtained in excavations in Delos which, from its close resemblance to our Vaison figure, has gone some way in confirming the opinion that this type of a young athlete really represents the original Diadumenos.

But why should a youth who has just gained one of the greatest prizes of life, and had been cheered like Ladas on an English racecourse—why should he be of so sad a mien? Was it this expression of countenance which Pliny had in his mind when he described the Diadumenos as a gentle youth, in contrast to the Doryphoros as a manly boy? It may have been so.

We have in the Museum another marble statue of a Diadumenos which differs from the rest in some important respects (Fig. 16). The action of raising both arms to fasten the diadem, the inclination of the head and the throwing of the weight of the body on the right leg are the same as in the others. But the type of face is quite different. The expression is that of pride or self-satisfaction, as became the winner of a great prize. The corners of the mouth, instead of being turned down as in melancholy, are turned up in joy. The left leg, instead of being thrown back like the others, as in a deferential attitude, is put forward proudly. Altogether, he answers to what we expect in a young athlete who has won one of the great prizes of life.

It is impossible to reconcile this statue with the others; both types cannot be traced to Polycleitos. And as the one just described, the Farnese Diadumenos, as it is called, stands alone, while the other type, that of the Vaison statue, exists in a number of ancient replicas, it has been argued that the Vaison statue, with its kindred, should be taken as representing the original of Polycleitos, and the Farnese statue referred to some other sculptor. We know, for instance, that Pheidias had made a statue of a Diadumenos, but it is not pretended that his hand is discoverable in the Farnese figure, though we cannot altogether deny that under its very poor execution there may lie a blundered survival of his statue. Nor does the Farnese figure answer in any way to what we know

of Praxiteles, who, on doubtful authority, is stated to have made a Diadumenos, or of Lysippos of whom it is known that he had taken the canon of Polycleitos as the basis of a new system of proportions.

The number of replicas of the Vaison type counts for much in favour of tracing it to a famous original. Meantime, I will call attention to the statue of an Amazon by Polycleitos. The story goes (Pliny, xxxiv. 53)



FIG. 17.—*Marble Head of Amazon. British Museum.*

that in a competition among sculptors for a statue of an Amazon to be placed in the temple of Diana at Ephesus, it was arranged that the decision should be left to the competing artists on the principle that each was to select the statue next best to his own. The result was that Polycleitos came out first, Pheidias next, Cresilas third.

In some of the existing Amazon statues the expression of melancholy is explained by a wound visible in her side, but others, which have no wound,



are similarly sad of countenance (Fig. 17). We are told that Cresilas, one of the competing sculptors, had made his Amazon wounded, and possibly those of the statues which exhibit a wound should be assigned to him. But, so far as Polycleitos is concerned, the question is, Was this pathetic expression to be explained apart from any sense of pain? The heads of the Diadumenos, especially one recently acquired by the Museum, seem to say yes. It will, I think, be allowed that the period of life between boyhood and manhood has no more marked characteristic than seriousness and grave demeanour; and that the observation of this had not escaped artists of the time of Polycleitos may be seen in the frieze of the Parthenon with its lines of young horsemen serious of face, grave and respectful of bearing. It was this period of youth that Polycleitos chose as his special field of sculpture; and we should not, therefore, find it strange that the faces of his statues are usually charged with an expression approaching to sadness.

The other type of "a manly boy," as represented in the Doryphoros, may be judged from the marble copies of that statue which have survived, especially the one in Naples. The features and the shape of the head do not differ much from those of the statues we have just been considering, but the expression of the face is not in any particular degree sad. The head is planted firmly on the neck instead of being bent bashfully to the side, and the glance is nearly straight forward. It will be allowed that these characteristics were rightly described by ancient writers as manly. It seems to me probable that the ancient copyist, in reproducing the heads of Polycleitos, had been more faithful than in the bodily forms, just because of the peculiar expression by which they were recognisable. But I do not feel the same confidence as to their fidelity in reproducing the bodily forms and proportions. It is no doubt true that the measurements of the Diadumenos and the Doryphoros, with their replicas, work out in a fairly satisfactory manner, whether we take the foot, the palm, or the digit as the unit of measurement, and, as Polycleitos is said by a not very authoritative writer to have employed the digit as his unit, this result has sometimes been cited as tending to prove that the proportions of these statues are true to his original, and embody his canon. It is unfortunate that the system of proportions handed down by Vitruvius, and worked out by Leonardo da Vinci, is stated to have been in use by



FIG. 18.—Bronze Statuette. *Hermes*. *British Museum*.



Lysippos and other sculptors, as well as by Polycleitos, which, of course, would be a flat contradiction of the statement that Lysippos had fundamentally changed the canon of Polycleitos. So far as I have seen, however, the Vitruvian system yields a type of figure which seems to correspond better with the sculptures of the frieze of the Parthenon—which were contemporary with Polycleitos—than with the Græco-Roman copies of the Doryphoros.

I have endeavoured to make the discussion of the style of Polycleitos as brief as possible, in view of the fact that we have at best only a very limited number of bronze statuettes that can be associated with him. We begin with one which in its proportions and attitude obviously ranges with the copies of the Diadumenos and Doryphoros. It is a figure of Hermes, found in France, and now in the British Museum (Fig. 18). Round its neck is a loose golden torc, which apparently had been added by a Gaulish owner. In the right hand is a purse, one of the symbols of Hermes as god of merchandise. From the left shoulder hangs a chlamys, which, though it is modern, has been correctly restored from other specimens. It is not claimed that Polycleitos had ever made a statue of Hermes of this or any other type. But it has been argued that this statuette is more or less true to his canon; and certainly if the marble statues we have been discussing reproduce that canon, there can be no hesitation in including our bronze in the same category. There is the same short body and long legs of the Lysippos pattern, while the head, both in its pose and shape, has retained much of Polycleitos, as also the attitude of standing with the weight of the body resting on the right leg, and the left foot thrown back.

Let us now notice a bronze statuette in the British Museum (Fig. 19), which seems to me nearer the ideal of Polycleitos than any of these figures we have been considering. The figure rests on the left leg instead of the right, while the right foot, thrown back a little, is planted with the sole full on the ground, not merely with the toes touching the ground as in the Diadumeni and the Doryphori. Correspondingly, the head is inclined towards the spectator's right. This bronze is no late copy like the last, but a true Greek work of the date to which we are assigning it, and in any case is one of the finest Greek bronzes we possess. I am endeavouring to give prominence to this figure, because among the vast number of statuettes

in our Museum it is almost unique in the closeness with which it approaches the youths of the Parthenon frieze in its proportions, in the inclination of the head and the rendering of bodily forms, and because I am

inclined to look rather to the Parthenon than to Græco-Roman copies for the truest analogies to Polycleitos.

It is possible that among our bronzes there are some which may yet be traced back to the great sculptor Myron, the fellow-pupil of Polycleitos. For the present, however, we have to be content with the little we do know of him. We are told that in his statues he gave more attention than any one of his time to a truthful representation of external details, caring little for the expression of character. In his statues of athletes his first aim was a telling and effective composition, with greater variety of action than Polycleitos allowed himself, but apparently with less refinement. It was Myron who first concentrated upon single statues the variety of movement which in older art was spread over many figures. His philosophy of life was to see the greatest possible display of action in one figure, and directed to one purpose.

We must remember that great as was the exactitude of Greek sculptors

in their observation of nature, they yet at times allowed themselves a freedom which strikes us as peculiar. For instance, they would on occasion give a lioness the mane of a lion, or a hind the antlers of a stag. Their principle was that to represent a thing which *seems* probable, though it may be impossible in fact, is a lesser error than to represent a thing which



FIG. 19.—Greek Bronze.  
British Museum.



*seems* improbable, however true it may be to fact. That is a principle of art laid down by Aristotle, and one of his instances is that of the hind with stag's antlers, which seems likely enough but is not true.



FIG. 20.—*Bronze Marsyas. British Museum.*

We are more fortunate in possessing a bronze figure of the Satyr Marsyas (Fig. 20), which, to some extent, may fairly be traced back to Myron. The style is doubtless much later. It cannot in fact be earlier than the

third or at most the fourth century B.C. There was therefore between our bronze and Myron an interval of two centuries or more, during which interval the representation of Satyrs in sculpture and every other form of Greek art was multitudinous. Nevertheless it is more than probable that the artistic motive of our bronze was originally Myron's. In the ancient list of his works mention is made of a group of the Satyr Marsyas and the goddess Athenè. Marsyas was there in the act of starting back in amazement when Athenè threw to the ground the flutes on which she had been trying to play. One or two ancient sketches of this group exist, and, though poor enough, they are sufficient to identify the attitude of Marsyas. Precisely the same attitude occurs in a fine marble statue of Marsyas in the Lateran Museum at Rome, which is accepted as a copy from Myron, and here we have it again in a slightly modified form in our bronze. It is an attitude which seems to me to be almost a challenge to Polycleitos and his Diadumenos, as much as to say, "If you wish the arms of a statue to be raised, raise them under some strong impulse like this, and not merely to fasten a diadem."

In our bronze the left hand is spread open with the fingers extended, as is usual in the expression of alarm. One would have expected the same in the right hand, but this is not the case. The right hand is merely thrown up to the head as if more in surprise than alarm. The strongly marked treatment of the beard and hair must be taken as illustrative of a particular period of art. In the sculptures of Pergamon, which belong to the second century B.C., we find the same rendering of the hair in rough unkempt masses. But we can trace much farther back the desire of Greek sculptors to obtain by means of a rough treatment of the hair an effective contrast to the smoothness of the face. We see it in the Hermes of Praxiteles. I do not suggest that something of the same kind may be traced even farther back, to Myron himself. Yet it is recorded of him by an ancient writer that with all his innovations in sculpture he had left the rendering of the hair just as it had been in "rude antiquity." I do not believe that this expression of "rude antiquity" can apply to our bronze. Still this expression of Pliny's requires some explanation.

In the myth of Marsyas and Athenè which Myron chose for his group the issue was of a milder description. Marsyas suffered nothing more

than alarm at the rage of the goddess when she threw the flutes to the ground. In this action of alarm Myron found a congenial motive. It provided him with an opportunity of displaying powerful action extending over the whole of the figure, yet concentrated upon one instantaneous impulse. This is very strikingly rendered in the Lateran statue, where the whole figure is strained violently backward by the sight of something on the ground. In our bronze the action is rather as if Marsyas had come running forward to pick up the flutes and had been suddenly arrested by a movement of Athenè. The sculptor was perfectly entitled to take that view, but it is unlikely that Myron had done so; from which we may conclude that our figure is not a direct copy but a later variant of his Marsyas, and only so far interesting to us on the present occasion.

## IV

### *Statuettes of the Age of Pheidias*

WHEN we come to the great age of Greek sculpture, it is true that as regards Pheidias himself we are so far fortunate as to possess the sculptures of the Parthenon. But incomparable as they are in illustrating the splendour of his genius in a series of compositions which have had no equal even in point of extent in the history of sculpture, there are times when one turns with longing and regret to the records of his isolated statues. We read and re-read the ancient descriptions of the chryselephantine statues of Zeus in the temple at Olympia and of Athenè in the Parthenon.

We rejoice when, in digging foundations for a house in Athens or Patras, a marble copy of the Athenè Parthenos comes to light (Fig. 21). We rejoice, because, with all the nudeness and imperfections of these copies, they still preserve something of the general effect of the original.

Among our bronze statuettes there is one that deserves attention from its relationship to the Athenè Parthenos (Fig. 22). Let me first notice certain differences of detail. The pose of the figure has been changed from the right to the left foot. The left hand may have rested on the edge of a shield as in the Parthenos. We cannot be certain. The right arm has been raised, and undoubtedly the hand has rested on a spear held upright. That is a distinct divergence from the Parthenos, where, as we have seen, the right hand holds out a Victory. In the dress the only difference is that the ægis is worn obliquely on the breast and not square across. But in the fragment which we possess of the Athenè from the west pediment of the Parthenon, the ægis is worn in the same oblique fashion. So that the idea was familiar to Pheidias, though he did not choose to employ it on his chryselephantine statue. The helmet

is correct in having three crests, and in showing the middle one supported on a sphinx. But the side crests have no Pegasi or gryphons connected with them.

In trying to account for these differences of detail we must not forget



FIG. 21.—*Marble Athenè Parthenos.*  
*Athens.*



FIG. 22.  
*Athenè Parthenos. Bronze Statuette.*  
*British Museum.*

that they are each and all perfectly consistent with the time and manner of Pheidias. They are not to be classed with those capricious changes in the aspect of Athenè which occur in late Greek art. In my judgment the whole statuette is as true to the style of Pheidias as could be expected of so minute a figure.



We are accustomed to think of Pheidias as a sculptor of colossal statues of gold and ivory, or of great compositions in marble brightened by colour and by accessories of metal. We seldom associate him with sculpture in bronze, though, in point of fact, a bronze statue in the atmosphere of Greece would have been resplendent enough to range even with figures of gold.

As regards his famous Athenè Promachos on the Acropolis of Athens, we are told by an ancient writer, Pausanias (i. 28, 2), that this statue had been erected as a monument of the victory over the Persians at Marathon, that the point of her spear and the crest of her helmet could be seen from ships approaching Athens from Cape Sunium, and that the reliefs on her shield, representing a battle between Centaurs and Lapiths, were a subsequent addition by a metal-chaser named Mys in the next century after Pheidias. On ancient coins representing the Acropolis of Athens (*B.M. Catalogue*, Attica, pl. 19, fig. 7) we see a colossal statue of Athenè standing on a spot where there is still visible on the rock of the Acropolis a cutting which had been made for the base of just such a statue. From the coins, it appears that the figure had stood with one foot advanced and the right arm raised in the act of hurling a spear. In this attitude the figure recalls the ancient and sacred image of Athenè known as the Palladion, and probably the intention of Pheidias was to retain this familiar attitude while changing the artistic treatment of the whole figure in accordance with the spirit of his own age. The title of Athenè Promachos, which had been associated with the archaic image, would naturally be used also of the new statue. One of our bronze statuettes (Fig. 23) answers admirably to the conception of a Promachos or fighter in the vanguard. This statuette comes from Athens, and seems to be plainly a production of the best period of art and undoubtedly derived from the statue by Pheidias, as it seems to me.

Let us now examine the statuette more closely. The helmet has only one crest; there is no ornament except the sphinx which supports the crest, and a sphinx in that position was apparently inseparable from the helmet of Athenè in the age of Pheidias, if, indeed, it was not invented by him. The Parthenos had three crests, but she was a stately show figure. The Promachos had to be warlike. As regards the ægis on her breast with the face of the Gorgon in the centre,

that is all in accordance with the age of Pheidias. It is only when we come to the drapery that we are struck with a peculiarity of treatment. The flat close-lying folds which are observed on the body and down the left side of the figure exhibit a distinct element of archaism, at variance with the perfect freedom of the Parthenon sculptures or of the copies of the *Athenè Parthenos*. On the other hand, the girdle of serpents is quite free in its treatment, and equally so is the face of the goddess. The question is how to reconcile this slight archaism with Pheidias. Before we say that this is impossible, there are several things to be taken into consideration. In the first place, we have as yet no authentic copy of any statue in bronze by him, and cannot say how he may have chosen to render his draperies while working in that material. But what is more to the point is that the bronze *Promachos* may have been a work of his early period when Greek sculpture was still in a measure under the influence of the archaic school in which he himself had been trained. The express statement of Pausanias (x. 10, 1) is, that the statue had been erected to commemorate the battle



FIG. 23.—*Athenè Promachos*. Greek Bronze.  
British Museum.

of Marathon, which was fought in 490 B.C. At that date Pheidias could only have been a boy, and as regards the sculpture of the time, we know how archaic it then was from a series of marble reliefs at Delphi, which have survived from a building erected there by the Athenians to celebrate the

glorious victory of Marathon, apparently soon after the event. We have, somehow, to account for the considerable interval of time which must have elapsed between the battle of 490 B.C. and the erection of the colossal bronze statue on the Acropolis. We know that ten years after the battle the Acropolis had been entirely destroyed by the Persians, so that whatever monument the Athenians may have set up there for their victory, if any, must have gone the way of all the rest in the general conflagration. During these ten years Pheidias was approaching towards manhood, and it is quite conceivable that amid the new adornment of the Acropolis, which commenced when the Persians had been finally discomfited, his rising genius had been recognised by his townsmen of Athens, and that the task had then been set him of producing the colossal *Athenè Promachos* in bronze. I am only suggesting what may well have happened. It was a number of years after that when the sculptures of the Parthenon were entrusted to him. But some such suggestion is necessary if our bronze statuette is, as I think, a copy of the colossal *Promachos*. As a young sculptor Pheidias may, like Raphael in his relations toward Perugino, have thrown into his work something of the archaic manner in which he had been trained. Or, at all events, his early training, still fresh in his mind, may have influenced him in retaining certain archaic elements which had been characteristic of the ancient type of *Athenè* which his statue was intended to supersede. We cannot ignore the express statement of Pausanias that his statue had been erected to commemorate the battle of Marathon. The best we can do in the circumstances is to ascertain the earliest possible date thereafter at which it could have been erected on the Acropolis. As we have seen, that date coincides with the early manhood of Pheidias.

The most famous in antiquity of all the works of Pheidias was his chryselephantine statue of Zeus at Olympia. Unfortunately we have no copies of it, except on certain very rare coins of Elis, on one of which an attempt is made to give a view of the statue in profile (Fig. 24), in another, the head alone, also in profile.

It is not, perhaps, surprising that no other copies of the great statue exist. We must remember that though Olympia was a great show-place where sculptures by the greatest artists of Greece were to be seen in profusion, yet it was not an art centre. No sculptors were established

there, nor any of the minor artistic industries, such as the making of bronze statuettes. Sculptors came there to do only what had to be done on the spot. Bronze statues—and they were the most frequent—were brought ready to be set up. The only exception we hear of was the workshop which Pheidias had erected for the making of his chryselephantine statue, and it is to the honour of those who managed the



FIG. 24.—Coin of Elis, representing the Zeus of Pheidias. From an Enlarged Drawing.

town that this workshop was retained as a memorial of him for centuries. People went to Olympia to see the sights, to be present at the national games, to hear distinguished literary men read passages of their works, and perhaps to see Zeuxis, the successful painter, living up to his reputation. So that once every four years the little town was crowded. For the rest it was known chiefly to tourists or occasional worshippers. Certainly there was no school of art at Olympia in the whole course of its existence. Years ago the site was carefully excavated. Innumerable



bronze statuettes were found, but none of them had any relation to the celebrated sculptures of the place. They had all been brought by devotees from other towns or districts.

Let us now take the description of the statue as we know it from ancient literary sources in connection with the coin (Fig. 24), premising that on a small coin the size of a florin many details would necessarily be left out. The attitude of the Zeus was that of a god seated on his throne as you see him in the coin. Literally, his presence filled the temple. It was said he could not stand up without carrying the roof with him. The height of the temple was 68 feet to the top of the pediments, so that the figure itself may well have been nearly 40 feet. The face, hands, and wherever flesh appeared, were of ivory, the rest was of gold—the dress, in particular, being richly enamelled with figures and flowers in various colours. The beard and hair we suppose to have been of gold. The ivory would be tinted to soften its whiteness, except perhaps in the eyes, where the natural whiteness of the material may have been taken advantage of. The pupils were either of precious stones or of ebony. On the head was an olive wreath. The right hand held out a Victory, which, as we see on the coin (Fig. 24), holds a *tænia* or ribbon, extending from one hand to the other, as in the Victory on the hand of the Athenè Parthenos. On the coin the Victory appears with raised wings as if about to fly across the front of the god, that is, from right to left, which we know was the direction always associated with a good omen in the minds of the Greeks. In the left hand of the god was a sceptre, glittering with various metals and surmounted by an eagle. The coin omits the eagle, and of course can give no equivalent for the metal inlays. The sandals were of gold. As regards the himation worn by the god, ancient writers tell us that it was richly enamelled, but say nothing of how it was disposed on the figure. For that we must rely principally on the coin. There we see that the himation is disposed in the manner usual with Pheidias—as in the east frieze of the Parthenon and on a Madrid relief. That is to say, it is wrapped closely round the lower limbs, then passes over the left shoulder, leaving the whole of the right arm and breast bare. It will be seen that the end of the himation appears between the fore leg of the throne and the legs of the god. That is an artistic touch which occurs on some of the best Athenian reliefs, immediately





FIG. 25.—Zeus. *Bronze found in Hungary. British Museum.*



after the time of Pheidias—most probably it had been introduced by him.

The throne was enriched with gold, precious stones, ebony, and ivory, while, as regards the multitude of figures sculptured on it—on the top rail, on the sides, on the legs, the footstool, and the base of the statue,—to read of them almost paralyses the imagination. On the top of each of the two front legs of the throne, connecting them with the side rail above, was a group of a sphinx tearing the body of a Theban youth. On the coin this has been simplified into a sphinx alone, much as on the throne of Zeus on the Parthenon frieze. At a lower level apparently along the sides of the seat were Apollo and Artemis slaying the children of Niobè. I suppose Apollo on one side slaying the sons, Artemis on the other slaying the daughters, each deity using bow and arrows.

The footstool rested on golden lions, and on it was sculptured a battle of Greeks and Amazons. Here the name of Pheidias, son of Charmides, was inscribed. On the base of the statue were sculptured, in a long comparatively narrow band, the deities of Olympus present at the birth of Aphrodite. In the centre of this assembly she (Aphrodite) was seen rising from the sea. At each side of the central group the deities were disposed in the order of their importance, so that the greatest of them were nearest the ends.

I do not attach any particular importance to a bronze statuette which we possess in the Museum (Fig. 25). It is far too hard and formal to convey any idea of the style of Pheidias as we know it in the Parthenon sculptures. The head is not like what we expect. It is much too conspicuous, with its staring wreath and profuse hair. We regret it the more readily because the head on one of the coins, to which I have referred, not only retains in its way the placidity of Pheidias, but also renders the wreath and the hair much as we think they had been. Our bronze is wrong also in having a thunderbolt in the left hand. In short, it cannot be a direct copy from the work of Pheidias. On the other hand, no one can deny that the model on which our statuette has been constructed was the Zeus of Olympia. In later Greek art there arose a tendency towards greater intensity of expression. As regards Zeus, people wanted a statue which should realise the passage of Homer: "When my head bows, all heads bow with it still." The curious thing is that a number of late

Greek writers associated this passage with the Zeus of Pheidias, whereas it only applied to the sculpture of their own day, such as our bronze statuette. But notwithstanding these modifications, there remained always in the later figures of Zeus much of the original of Pheidias, and of this our bronze is an illustration, because both in the posture of the god and in the disposition of the drapery it is correct in a general way.

## V

### *Statuettes of the Age of Praxiteles and Lysippos*

AFTER the death of Pheidias some time elapsed before a new name of surpassing importance appeared among Greek sculptors. During this interval the art of Greece, unable to sustain the high idea of Pheidias, was preparing for a change. It was turning towards a greater perfection of technical skill with less imaginative power. The same tendency had arisen alike in poetry, painting, and sculpture.

This state of the artistic mind had been ripening some time in Greece when the sculptor Praxiteles came on the scene. An Athenian by birth and the son of a sculptor not unknown to fame, he seems to have readily divined that the best way to express in sculpture the ideas of his time was by means of isolated statues in which, with only very slight action or movement, he would be able to display his extraordinary skill in rendering the finest and subtlest forms of the body. His object was, at the same time, to represent the finer emotions such as only very slightly affect the bodily forms. Let us take as an example the marble statue of Hermes holding on his arm the infant god Dionysos, which was found a number of years ago at Olympia, on the spot where an ancient writer had seen it (Fig. 26). At various times since its discovery this statue has been thought to be not quite equal to the great name of Praxiteles, or that perhaps it had been a work of his earlier period when still under the influence of his father. Several things point in this latter direction. The massiveness of the torso of Hermes is not what we shall find in others of his statues such as the Sauroctonos, but in this respect reminds us more of his father's statue of Eirenè carrying the infant Plutos on her arm, which infant, again, is almost identical with the infant Dionysos on



the arm of Hermes. But these things notwithstanding, the statue is full of the subtlest observation of bodily forms which cannot, one would



FIG. 26.—*Hermes by Praxiteles. Olympia.*

think, be traced to any other than Praxiteles himself. Similarly, the motive or action of the Hermes is exactly of that very slight kind which we expect from that sculptor more than any other. Hermes, as we now

know, had held up in his right hand a bunch of grapes, and is watching its effect on the infant god of the vine. The drapery hanging on a tree stem, however beautifully executed, is only an accessory, serving as a



FIG. 27.—Marble Statue. *Apollo Sauroctonos*. *Louvre*.

foil to the delicate modelling of the bodily forms. And when we think of it, that was a great change from the treatment of drapery in the Parthenon sculptures, where the presence of drapery is never accidental, but always shares in the dignity and solemnity of the figure. Even in

the draped figures of Praxiteles as in the Muses of Mantinea, we see that he had created a new type which differs from that of the Parthenon inas-



FIG. 28.—*Apollo. From Thessaly. British Museum.*

much as it is a special study of a draped figure. Another point is the easy attitude of the Hermes, suggestive almost of indolence, or at all events of a happy nature. In others of the statues by Praxiteles, known



FIG. 29.—*Bronze Statuette. Aphrodite Pourtalès. British Museum.*





to us from ancient copies, this ease of attitude is more strongly marked. But from this point of view the most interesting of his works is the statue of Apollo Sauroctonos (Fig. 27), known to us from several copies in marble, and from one, a large statuette in bronze in the Villa Albani, which is the more important because the original statue was in bronze. The god stands leaning idly, one hand stretched out to a tree, his attention being attracted slightly to a lizard running up the tree-stem. He may be intending to kill the lizard, as his name Sauroctonos implies, but the attitude hardly conveys any feeling on his part beyond that of curiosity. The motive merely gives occasion for a youthful figure standing in an attitude admirably conceived to display the beauties of bodily form under a passing, almost trivial, emotion.

It is interesting to compare this Apollo with a marble statue in Madrid which it is now agreed is to be traced back to Praxiteles. The Madrid statue represents Hypnos, the god of sleep, moving silently on his task of hushing mankind to rest. It is not only that the type of face is almost identical with that of the Apollo, though this counts for much because it is a very peculiar type, but in both statues we recognise at once that the aim of the sculptor had been to represent an action which must not be more than just perceptible. In the *Greek Anthology* (Appendix 277) there occurs a few lines of verse headed an *Ænigma on Sleep* to this effect: "Being neither a mortal nor an immortal, but having some semblance of both, I live neither the part of a man nor of a god, but am always coming new into life and again vanishing from the present, unseen to the eye, yet known of all men." We have there in words the evanescent character of Hypnos. The Greeks thought sleep a twin brother of death, and perhaps this relation of twinship was meant to suggest that same idea of a being differentiated from some one else only by the slightest touches. Effects of this kind, whether in art or nature, are usually called fascination, and probably no better word could be found to serve as a general characterisation of the work of Praxiteles than its fascination.

We have already spoken of the god of sleep and his silent seductive mission, in connection with the bronze head of Hypnos which is one of our treasures in the Museum (Plate II.). We need only now consider the head again for the sake of its striking likeness to the heads of the Apollo and of the statue in Madrid. The singular breadth of the face is a thing to

be noticed. It does not occur in the *Hermes*, where it would have been unsuitable, but from the other instances where it does occur we may fairly conclude that Praxiteles had created it for a special order of beings in whose nature, as he conceived, there existed a happy imperturbability. He was probably well aware of the fact that under sensations of pleasure the muscles of the face work sideways, and had sought to express this observation under a permanent type.

The indolent attitude of leaning sideways with the feet crossed or nearly so, as in the statues of *Apollo*, is carried farther in a bronze statuette of the same god from Thessaly which we possess (Fig. 28). But the type of face in our bronze is too formal and too little sensitive for Praxiteles. The rendering of the hair is too hard and the bodily forms too vague. It may be that these faults are due to the maker of the statuette and not to the original from which he was copying. We cannot believe that Praxiteles had ever himself carried this attitude of indolence so far.

Praxiteles owed his greatest fame to his works in marble, but an ancient writer (Pliny, xxxiv. 69), while admitting this, says that he nevertheless produced statues of the greatest beauty in bronze. We have in the Museum a bronze statuette of *Aphroditè* obviously Praxitelian in style (Fig. 29). So far as the attitude and accessories are concerned, there is a difference of opinion. In the list of bronze statues by Praxiteles, Pliny mentions a figure which he calls a *Pseliumenè*, that is to say, a woman or goddess wearing or putting on an armlet. It has been argued that this Greek epithet may mean also the putting on of a necklace, and that this is the action of our bronze. I doubt if this can be right. The action is more like a reminiscence of the *Diadumenos* of Polycleitos, both hands being raised as if just having finished the fastening of a diadem or ribbon round the head. In our bronze the movement of the arms is practically the same as in that statue, and we know from tradition that Praxiteles did modify the older type of a *Diadumenos* by Polycleitos. At all events it seems to me beyond question that our bronze is a Praxitelian variant of that statue adapted to a female figure. It will be noticed how strong is the resemblance between the head of the statuette and the head of *Hypnos* (Plate II.), especially in the very beautiful treatment of the hair with



*Hypnos, God of Sleep, Early Fourth Century, B.C.*

*Under 2 cols. 79, 80*

*British Museum.*



its soft tresses carried back from the brow and bound in the simplest possible manner with a narrow fillet.



FIG. 30.—*Marble Statue of an Apoxyomenos. Vatican Museum.*

After Praxiteles a number of years elapsed before the next great sculptor, Lysippos, appeared on the scene. He had been exclusively a sculptor in bronze, and one would expect to find among the many bronzes of our



museums not a few specimens directly traceable to his influence, the more so as he had been productive to an extraordinary degree, and because his works were in demand far and wide. But there are difficulties. Take for instance the statue of a young athlete scraping his arm with a strigil, usually called an Apoxyomenos (Fig. 30). The original bronze statue had been carried off from Greece to Rome, and is said to have so captivated



FIG. 31.—*Limestone Figure of Heracles. British Museum.*

the young Tiberius that he had it removed to his palace, and only restored it to its public position because of the clamour of the populace. A beautiful marble copy of that statue is well known in the Vatican Museum. We are told expressly by Pliny that the bronze original was the work of Lysippos.

Then take a small limestone figure in the British Museum (Fig. 31), which, for all its roughness, is certainly a copy of the bronze statuette made

by Lysippos as a present, it is said, to his patron, Alexander the Great, who carried it about in his campaigns to decorate his table. In later Roman poets there is much romance as to the famous generals through whose hands that bronze had passed after the death of Alexander, and I need hardly add to the romance by stating that our rough copy of it comes from Babylonia, where the great Macedonian died. The subject of the statuette by Lysippos was a seated figure of Heracles, called, from its constant appearance on the table of Alexander, Epitrapezios. The sculptor of our limestone copy has inscribed his name on the plinth. His name is Diogenes. But I do not suggest that he was any relation of the Cynic philosopher whose interview with Alexander is more than ever familiar to us from Landseer's parody of the two dogs. The question is, does our statuette with all its roughness convey any fair impression of the original of Lysippos, and, if so, how is that impression to be reconciled with the very different style of the Apoxyomenos in the Vatican? It is conceivable that in the course of a long life Lysippos had begun his career under the dominating influence of Praxiteles, had gradually added more and more of action and animation to his statues, and had finally gone over to a preference for figures of the Heracles type in which muscular power was the ruling feature, the Apoxyomenos representing his earlier, the Heracles his later stage. To the later stage would belong his numerous statues of athletes, his portraits, and probably also the tendency towards statues of colossal size which appears in his Heracles at Tarentum, and was carried to an extreme in the Colossus of Rhodes by his pupil Chares.

In the Apoxyomenos we have the small head, the apparent increase of height, and a new system of proportions superseding the older system of greater massiveness in the torso, which Pliny tells us was characteristic of Lysippos. You have only to compare it with the Hermes of Praxiteles to see the difference, and yet I am convinced that in the general conception, and in the rendering of the details in the Apoxyomenos, Lysippos was largely indebted to Praxiteles. It must have been also in the spirit of Praxiteles that he chose as a subject for a statue Kairos or Opportunity—a statue which is described by ancient writers as having represented a boy or youth hasting along on tiptoe with wings to his heels, his hair rich and full over the brow, but shorn at the back to show that Opportunity, once

let slip, cannot be caught up again, in his right hand a razor, in allusion to a Greek proverb, as old as Homer, to the effect that the turn of things is often balanced on as fine an edge as that of a razor (*ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς*). We have no copy of that figure in the shape of statuary, but we have certain variations of it on engraved gems, and in a relief where he appears running hastily, having wings on his shoulders and heels, and holding out a pair of scales to indicate by how slight a turn of the balance great events may ensue. To my mind, this representation of Kairos, together with the literary descriptions of the statue, irresistibly recalls the Hypnos of Praxiteles. A statue of the "Fleeting Opportunity" would naturally start from such a figure as that of Hypnos, so much is there in common between the two thoughts of sleep with his silent movement and opportunity which waits on no one.

Critics have been puzzled by the fact that so good a judge of art as the Roman writer Quintilian classes Praxiteles and Lysippos as the two Greek sculptors who approached closest to the truth of nature. So far as Lysippos is concerned, this appears to be right. His list of portrait statues, his frequent choice of muscular types such as Heracles, Zeus, or Poseidon, and his minute attention to details, all seem to indicate a close observer of nature. But Praxiteles could not, it was supposed, be in the same boat. *He* made no statues of athletes. The only known portrait from his hand was a statue of Phrynè at Delphi, and even it, there is reason to believe, had not been a portrait in a strict sense, but rather an ideal figure, which some people, as Pliny says, had identified as Phrynè. A close observer of passing shades of character or of emotion, Praxiteles was, so far, rightly classed along with Lysippos as regards truth to nature, the one more in a spiritual, the other more in a physical sense.

Among the bronze statuettes, which it is usual to identify with the style of Lysippos, is a figure of Poseidon found at Dodona towards the end of the last century, and now in the British Museum (Fig. 32). In the statuette the god stands resting on one foot, and has held out in the left hand most probably a dolphin indicative of the sea, while his right hand has been raised to rest on a trident held vertically. The proportion of the short torso to long legs answers to the new canon which Lysippos introduced. According to that canon the head ought perhaps to have been smaller. But in art, as in poetry, the god of the sea was known for his massive



FIG. 32.—*Bronze Statuette from Dodona (Paramythia). Poseidon. Ancient base. British Museum.*







FIG. 33.—*Bronze Statuette from Dodona (Paramythia). Youth pouring Libation. British Museum.*





*British Museum.*

*Walter L. G. G. G. G. G.*

*Zeus, from Dodona.*



head and abundance of hair. The sculptor could not change that type. Lysippos was famed above his contemporaries for minute finish down to the smallest details. Another ancient statuette could not be found where this is more admirably exemplified. The hair and beard are full of the most beautiful workmanship carried into the minutest details, while the powerful bodily forms are rendered with an extraordinary refinement extending to the observation of the finer muscles in the feet and even to a vein in the left arm. The animation he was said to have imparted to his statues (*animosa signa*) is conspicuous in the bronze.

From the same find at Dodona we have also a figure of Zeus, which may equally claim to belong to the school of Lysippos (Plate III.). Extremely remarkable are the intense expression of the face, and the minute finish of the masses of hair and beard. In the bodily forms the proportions are those of Lysippos, but there is a want of the finer modelling of details and the clearer distinction of the various parts of the body, so noticeable in the Poseidon. Lysippos is known to have produced several statues of Zeus, among them a Colossus at Tarentum, measuring in height over 60 feet. It is said that this statue had been so balanced that it could be moved by the hand, and yet could resist the force of storms, the explanation being that the sculptor had provided a column or support on the side opposite the usual weather quarter, leaving a slight space between the column and the figure to allow of yielding. Here we may add also Fig. 33 from the same find at Dodona, though as yet we have no evidence as to how Lysippos rendered his draperies, and cannot therefore be confident in associating this bronze with his style. Still more difficult is it to feel on quite safe ground in assigning to him or to his influence a very beautiful bronze in the British Museum given on Plate IV., representing a youthful heroic figure seated on a rock and looking eagerly downwards. The singular animation of the face answers to what we know of Lysippos, but the largeness and simplicity of style, displayed both in the bodily forms and in the drapery, are not quite what we are prepared to expect from him. So far as the bodily forms are concerned, we expect to see them more broken up by details. Therein, however, we may be wrong, and in any case our bronze, if it does not fully illustrate his style, is one of the finest existing examples of



Greek bronze-work at its ripest period. The figure is cast solid, and has been attached to a background of some sort. The eyes are inlaid with silver.

I will notice next one of the bronzes of Siris (Fig. 34), that is the name which for many years has attached to two bronze reliefs said to have been found near the river Siris in Southern Italy in 1820. It was in this locality that the memorable battle occurred in which Pyrrhus was signally defeated. The wish to connect everything beautiful or remarkable with some famous person produced the suggestion that these bronzes may have belonged to the armour worn by Pyrrhus on that day. The suggestion was enticing, and not much worse if so bad as many others. At all events we have the bronzes, and are concerned most with their beauty as examples of Greek relief. From a technical point of view, these bronzes are no less than marvellous as examples of repoussé work. The quality of the bronze must have been originally fine beyond all praise or comparison, to admit of being hammered up to the extraordinary extent which it reaches in the chest and faces of the Greek. In some points it has failed, and separate pieces have been made and attached in their place. Then, again, the minuteness with which the whole surface has afterwards been gone over is endless; most elaborate patterns have been incised on the shields; the beard has been worked with almost microscopic faithfulness, and yet with perfect freedom of touch; the minutest folds of the drapery have been followed from their origin to their final disappearance into some other larger fold, or into airy nothingness. These are facts which suit no Greek sculptor, of whose practice we know from ancient writers, better than Lysippos. He was famed for a combination of minute finish and a rigorous system of proportions. He was the most prominent sculptor at the time at which we should place these bronzes from other considerations, and without claiming him as the sculptor of them, we may yet fairly regard them as influenced by his manner, as in fact among the best evidence we possess of his special method of working.

We may pass on to a bronze equestrian statuette in Naples Museum, which appears to have been part of a group representing Alexander on horseback striking down at an enemy (Fig. 35). We know that after the battle at the Granicus, Lysippos was directed to



*British Museum*

*Walter & Cottis, Photo.*

*Heracles Figure.*





FIG. 34.—*Bronze Relief. Greek striking down an Amazon. Fourth Century B.C. British Museum.*





make a commemorative group of Alexander and those who were nearest him in the fight, in all, twenty-five figures, each a portrait. That



FIG. 35.—*Alexander the Great. Large Bronze Statuette. Naples Museum.*

group was erected in Macedonia, but subsequently was carried off by Metellus to Rome, and possibly the Naples bronze represents the central figure of that composition.

## VI

### *Gaulish Bronzes*

CERTAIN ancient writers attribute to the Gauls the invention of enamelling and niello on bronze and silver (Philostratus, *Imag.* i. 28, and Pliny, xxxiv. 162), and it is a fact that many specimens of bronze vases, fibulæ, and other objects have been found richly if sometimes rudely enamelled. The process was to groove out the patterns on the surface of the bronze. Into these grooves, forming generally floral patterns, a paste of various bright colours was inlaid, such as red, white, blue, and green. But it does not appear that this paste had been fused in the true sense of an enamel, that is to say until it took the form of glass, though the Greek writer who mentions this Gaulish invention expressly speaks of fusing the inlaid substance.

Let us begin with a bronze statuette in the British Museum found at Barking Hall, Suffolk (Fig. 36). It is about 2 feet high, and must have been a work of considerable difficulty, if we think of the elaborate extent with which the cuirass is decorated with patterns, inlaid partly in silver and partly in a sort of enamel, the leaves of the rosettes being alternately of enamel and silver. I take this figure first, because it seems to stand on the border between pure classic workmanship and native art. It has been described as a portrait of a Roman Emperor or an imperial personage of some sort ; but an insuperable obstacle to its being an imperial Roman is that the hair is bound by a simple ribbon or diadem, whereas the Roman emperors wore wreaths, usually of laurel, until a very late period, when they preferred rich gold diadems. Clearly the statuette cannot represent a Roman. On the other hand, nothing was more distinctive of a Greek king, from the time of Alexander the Great onwards, than a flat fillet or

ribbon worn exactly as on our statuette. That alone is conclusive evidence that the figure is either Alexander or one of his successors. The portraits



FIG. 36.—Bronze found at Barking Hall, Suffolk. British Museum.

of his successors are known from their coins, and we may fairly exclude them from the running. There remains, therefore, only Alexander himself.

We have already spoken of certain portraits of Alexander by Lysippos.

One of the attitudes in which he was represented was, as we know, that of standing with one foot raised on a rock or such like, the head appearing to be turned a little sideways so as to conceal his natural defect of a crooked neck. In particular there was one in which he appeared with his face looking towards the heavens, as he was wont to look, says Plutarch, and turning his neck gently, so that some one on seeing a statue of him in this attitude wrote an epigram to this effect, that the bronze seemed to be looking towards the heavens and saying, "The earth is under my rule. You, Zeus, hold Olympos." Several other Greek epigrams exist to much the same purpose. It is known also that in that instance Alexander held a spear, necessarily in his right hand. In our statuette the raised right hand has obviously rested on a spear. These are facts enough to justify us in regarding it as a figure of Alexander derived from a famous original of Lysippos.

The face of our bronze is that of an ideal youth, yet the hair springs from the forehead somewhat in the manner characteristic of the portraits of Alexander. No objection can be taken to the cuirass and sandals. They are such as he might have worn, except for the rich enamel on the cuirass, and particularly the promiscuous way in which the patterns of rosettes are scattered all over it. We must acquit classical sculptors of any share in that.

The treatment of the hair seems at first sight, purely classical, all the more so when we remember how frequently the existing Gaulish bronzes are characterised by rough shaggy hair, in keeping with the habits of the people. Yet when we examine the hair closely, in particular the loose way in which the diadem lies among it instead of being tightly strained round the head, we detect a want of intelligence which cannot be ascribed to a classical artist. It is best explained by assuming the sculptor to have been a Gaul or Briton making a careful copy from a Greek original as well as he could. In the flaps of the cuirass, as they fall over the raised thigh, there are one or two fine touches of movement which could only have been derived from a Greek original. The proportions of the figure are abnormally heavy, the torso being much too massive and the legs too short. It would be hard to find any parallel for that in classical art.

Yet, for all these shortcomings, we have in the Museum bronze

the finest existing specimen of Gaulish sculpture inspired by a Greek original.

We may take next a bronze in the British Museum, found in France in the department of the Rhone (Fig. 37). It is a figure of the youthful



FIG. 37.—*Gaulish Statuette of Bacchus. British Museum.*

Bacchus holding in his right hand a wine-cup. But the wine-cup or cantharus which he holds is not of the shape proper to Bacchus. It is, in fact, a small amphora. No classical artist could have ever made that mistake. The figure itself has obviously been studied from a Greek original. Yet it is throughout pervaded by a difference of artistic feeling, which it is easier to recognise than to define—a difference such as we perceive often in



literature between an excellent translation and the original. The face and disposition of the hair, together with the pose of the head, remind us of Praxiteles as we know him in the statue of Apollo Sauroctonos. The attitude might pass for Praxitelian. But the extreme softness of the bodily forms goes beyond anything with which we are acquainted from his hand, though it must be allowed that at present we know nothing of how he had rendered such figures as the youthful Bacchus. There must have been more effeminacy in them than in Hermes and Apollo.

Let us now take an example of a different kind (Fig. 38). The British Museum possesses a large bronze statuette, which was found near the Roman wall in Cumberland or Northumberland, it is uncertain which. The bronze is gilt and still looks almost like gold. It is a figure of Heracles, and since an altar inscribed to the Tyrian Heracles has been discovered in that neighbourhood, we may fairly assume that our bronze may have been made for some devotee of that particular deity. Now we know that some of the oldest coins struck in Gaul and Britain are obviously imitations of the more ancient coinage of the Greek island of Thasos, on which there occurs a figure of the Tyrian Heracles, not exactly identical with our bronze, but sufficiently like for identification.

The sculptor of our bronze was under no obligation to keep close to the type of Heracles on the coins of his day. He may easily have had access to more archaic types like the two vases by Calamis mentioned in Pliny (xxxiv. 47). In any case it is an archaic Greek element which predominates in our statuette. The girdle round the waist, with its three clasps fastened in front, corresponds perfectly to archaic bronze girdles in the British Museum. The short chiton, drawn tightly across the body and gathered in folds at the sides, was not worn by Heracles except in archaic Greek art of about the sixth century B.C. The short body of the figure, in striking contrast to the long massive legs, is obviously archaic. Equally so is the manner of standing with both feet flat on the ground. The way in which the lion's skin is worn, the head of the lion fitting like a cap on the head of Heracles, is archaic, but not exclusively so. It lasted on to later times, yet we may fairly rank it also with the other archaic elements of the figure. The lion's skin is twisted round the left arm like a piece of drapery instead of skin. That we must set down as a mistake. As regards the forcible action of the left hand with the fingers tightly com-



FIG. 38.—*Heracles. Found in Cumberland. British Museum.*



pressed, the only explanation I can find is from an archaic Etruscan bronze in the British Museum where Heracles grips with his left hand the tail of the lion's skin exactly in this manner. The right hand, which is raised, has held a club. The only non-archaic feature in our statuette is the face, which is strikingly of the type that came into Greek art at the time of Alexander the Great, and, as such, might have been familiar to Gaulish sculptors, on coins or otherwise.

For these reasons our statuette is peculiarly interesting. It shows how a phase of Greek art, which had been abandoned for centuries in Greece itself, had survived in specimens brought to Gaul or Britain, and had there appeared to native sculptors as a new light on their path, much as the archaic pre-Raphaelite painting of Italy appealed to our countrymen not so long ago. The statuette is cast solid, and in this respect may perhaps serve as a confirmation of what Pliny says, that the true art of casting in bronze had been lost before his time.

We have also in the British Museum a statuette of Mars from the Rhine-land which may fairly come within the scope of our present enquiry (Fig. 39). It represents the god in full panoply with nothing Celtic in his armour or costume. The model has been purely classical. But let us examine the figure. The face and hair are not Celtic in type, but equally they are non-classical in the roughness with which they are represented, reminding us in this respect of what is constantly found among Gaulish bronzes. The proportions are ungainly and inaccurate to a high degree, and yet there are not a few details which recall Greek art of a good period. For instance, the form and decoration of the helmet have been derived from the *Athenè Parthenos* of Pheidias in the main. The sphinx which has supported the crest was an invention of Pheidias. The two gryphons here attached to the sides of the helmet were placed by Pheidias on the upturned cheek-pieces of *Athenè's* helmet, and were there rendered in relief, not, as here, partly in the round. The visor, which in the *Athenè* retained its pure Greek form, is here converted into a mask, as if of a dead person, reminding us of a bronze helmet in the British Museum, found at Ribchester in Lancashire, which has a visor entirely in the form of a sepulchral mask. On the lower part of the visor of our statuette is a ram's head in relief on each side, which also is a not uncommon form of decoration on classical helmets. The two gryphons confronted on the

cuirass are obviously Greek in origin, as is also the small head of Medusa in silver on the breast. On the greaves, in front of each knee, is again a small head of Medusa in silver, the one completely defaced, the other still showing the features of the Gorgon. Among the Greeks these masks of Medusa were worn as charms against danger. We find them repeatedly on their bronze greaves, especially on those of the good period, as on the splendid bronze leg we possess in the British Museum. The greaves are laced down the back, and the laces inlaid with a reddish Celtic enamel. The flaps of the cuirass are inlaid with silver, as are also the eyes of the figure.

We must notice the way in which the chiton is rendered, where it is visible, hanging below the flaps of the cuirass. The chiton is made to open at each side, and to fall on each side in a double set of zigzag folds such as we call pteryges or wings when speaking of the chiton of Athenè. But the Greek chiton can only have these double zigzag folds on one side of the figure because the chiton is only open on one side. It is incredible that the sculptor of our bronze could ever have seen a Greek figure with a chiton thus open on both sides. More probably he had been struck by the singular charm which Greek artists constantly obtained from those zigzag folds in their draped figures, and had not recognised the fact that they were confined to the left side, still more that in a man's chiton they do not exist at all. That, of course, is ignorance, but it is ignorance coupled with artistic perception.

Heracles came nearest in the minds of the Gauls and Britons to what they conceived their Supreme Deity to be like. But in most cases they did not keep too close to the classical model, rather introducing variations suitable to their own ideas and circumstances. They called Heracles Ogmios, and we have in the Greek writer Lucian (*Heracles*) a description of a picture of that deity which may be taken as perhaps an extreme instance of the freedom the Celtic artists allowed themselves in adding to the Greek type. The Heracles or Ogmios which Lucian describes wore the usual lion's skin, held a club in his right hand, a bow in his left, with a quiver at his side. So far he is quite Greek. But he had the appearance of a man in extreme old age, wrinkled and worn. All round him in the picture was a crowd of human beings, each having fastened to his ear a fine gold chain, the other end of which was attached to the tongue





FIG. 39.—*Gaulish Statuette of Mars. British Museum.*



of Ogmios. Astonished at so singular a conception, Lucian inquired of an educated Gaul what might be the meaning of the picture,



FIG. 40.—*Gaulish Heracles.* Bronze Statuette found at Vienne in France.

and was told it was a representation of the power of eloquence to draw men.

But Lucian's picture of Ogmios is hardly more curious than a bronze

statuette found some years ago at Vienne in France (Fig. 40). It is a figure of Heracles of a good classical type, though with the usual differences of style, which, as I said before, are like the differences between a good translation and an original. What is startling is the ring of barrel-shaped objects which appears like a nimbus above the head of the figure. These curious objects are supported on a thin rod which rises behind the statuette. The meaning of them is still far from clear, notwithstanding the amount of attention bestowed on them by scholars versed in Celtic literature. It is much to be regretted that this is so, because these objects are certainly symbols of some kind which must have conveyed a definite meaning to the ancient Gauls. They cannot be merely capricious ornaments. In many cases we find among Gaulish sculptures a god having the symbol of a hammer or mallet, and it is not difficult to explain that deity in connection with the northern god Thor or the Greek Hephaistos. Applying this to the bronze statuette of Vienne, we could accept as hammers the five smaller things which radiate from the large cylinder. But the large cylinder itself must surely be something different. It is more like a barrel, and possibly that is what it was meant to be. Heracles as a wine-god would not have appeared particularly strange even to the Greeks. They were familiar with his habits. To the Gauls, in the wine-growing districts of France, he might easily have assumed the additional functions of a wine-god.

There is one thing yet which must not be overlooked. Among the Gaulish bronzes are many figures wearing the national costume, which consists of a thick buff coat wrapped closely round the body, overlapping down the front, and kept together by a girdle round the waist, to which we may add occasionally trousers of a chequered pattern. The question we have to consider is whether the Gaulish artists had themselves been the originators of this idea of representing their kinsmen in the garb in which they lived. That a people just emerging from barbarism could have had the faculty of creating an artistic type such as this of their own nationality is more than we are prepared to believe. The skill with which the costume is rendered in not a few instances has clearly been learned from classical sculpture, and, above all, we have to remember that one of the most striking features of later Greek art was the prominence given to figures of Gauls, carefully represented both in character



FIG. 41.—Gaulish Chief. *Bronze Statuette. British Museum.*





and costume. The old Celtic peoples had been a terror to the Greeks almost from the time of Homer. They swooped down on the rich cities of Asia Minor like Children of the Mist as they were. In Greece itself they got as far as Delphi under their leader Brennus early in the third century B.C. For nearly a century before then Rome had been trembling at the name of the Gauls. But from that time onward great battles became frequent. In the second century B.C. the King of Pergamos in Asia Minor defeated the Gauls in a decisive victory. He must needs erect on the Acropolis of Athens a monument of his success, and this, so far as we know, was the first occasion on which the nationality of the Gauls was represented on any great scale in Greek sculpture. The Emperors of Rome followed in a similar spirit, covering their triumphal arches and columns with endless expeditions against the Celts, battles, sieges, and all the horrors of war. So that among what survives of the sculpture of those days we find innumerable studies of the personal appearance of the Gauls, the feelings of despair with which they accepted defeat, and their sufferings when wounded. Probably the examples best known to you are the so-called "Dying Gladiator" in Rome, which is, in fact, a wounded Gaul, and the group of a Gaul slaying his wife rather than see her become a Roman captive. I mean the group known as Arria and Pætus in the Villa Ludovisi in Rome. Fig. 41 will serve as an example in bronze.

In the mirror of works such as these the Gauls saw themselves for the first time in an artistic sense. It was not necessary for them to create new types of themselves, even if in those days they had possessed enough imaginative power to do so. It is reported of an ancient Teuton who had gone to Rome on an embassy that, being shown a statue of an old shepherd leaning on his staff, and being asked what he would value it at, replied that he would not take him as a present even if he were alive. But a remark like this is not enough to condemn a whole nationality. You may overhear much the same any day. What we do know on the strength of the Carlisle bronze and not a few other works in sculpture is, that the peoples in Gaul and Britain were being familiarised, slowly perhaps, with Greek art even long before the Roman conquest.

In the sixth century B.C. a Greek colony had been established at Marseilles, whence it could command the trade of the Rhone valley. At

that time, and even before then, Greek merchants were finding their way by sea to the copper mines of Spain, and obtaining, directly or indirectly, tin from Cornwall. Greek colonists were gathered round the silver mines of Thrace and along the north shore of the Black Sea, especially in the neighbourhood of the Crimea, where the inhabitants, though known as Scythians, were a branch of the widely-spread Celtic race. From the tombs of Kertch we know to what extent the Greek settlers had imported beautiful works of Athenian art for exchange with the products of the rude Scythians, and from ancient literature we know how eagerly some of the chiefs of that race had applied themselves to Hellenic civilisation. In Central Europe there have been found from time to time valuable objects of archaic Greek art, such as the gold treasure of Vettersfelde, or the lovely helmet of Berru, with its ornamentation of the Mycenæan Age. I can only mention these things briefly, because all I wish to suggest is that centuries before the Roman conquest there had been going on among the Gauls and Britons a slow leavening of artistic taste by means of works of art imported from Greece.

# INDEX

- ACROPOLIS of Athens, 6, 8, 18, 21, 26, 28, 29, 56, 58, 101  
 Alexander the Great, 6, 23, 75, 85, 86, 93  
 Alexander on horseback, 82  
 Alexander, Statuette of, 88  
 "Amazon," 45, 46  
 Antenor, 23, 24, 25  
 Apelles, 40  
 "Aphroditè," 13, 63, 72  
 "Apollo," 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 63, 71, 90  
 "Apollo Ismenios," 13  
 "Apollo Philesios," 13  
 "Apollo Sauroctonos," 65, 71, 90  
 "Apoxyomenos," 74, 75  
 Archaic fibula, 9  
 Archermos (of Chios), 20, 21  
 Archermos, Sons of (Athenis and Bupalos), 21  
 Aristotle, 42  
 "Arria and Pætus," Group of, 101  
 Artemis, 63  
 Assyria, Arts of, 17  
 "Athenè," 8, 13, 25, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 93, 94  
 "Athenè Parthenos," 56, 57, 60, 93  
 "Athenè Promachos," 56, 58  
 Athens, 23, 25  
 "BACCHUS," 89, 90  
 Barking Hall, Suffolk, 86  
 Berru, Helmet of, 102  
 Bronze, Æginetan, 12  
 Bronze, Composition of, 9  
 Bronze mirrors, 8, 31  
 Bronze of Siris, 82  
 CALAMIS, 26, 90  
 Canachos, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15  
 Cato, 36  
 Centaurs and Lapiths, Battle between, 56  
 Chapu, M., 5, 6  
 Chares, 75  
 Chios, 20, 21  
 Chryselephantine statue, 59  
 Cicero, 14  
 Coinage of Miletus, 10  
 Coins of Elis, 58  
 "Colossus of Rhodes," 75  
 Corinth, 9, 36, 39  
 Corinthian artists, 36, 39  
 Corinthian bronze, 9  
 Cresilas, 45, 46  
 "Criophoros," 26  
 DAIDALOS, 18, 25  
 Darius, King of Persia, 10, 15  
 Delos, 20, 21, 44  
 Delphi, 57  
 "Diadumenos," 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 52, 72  
 Didyma, 12  
 "Dionysos," 65  
 "Doryphoros," 44, 46, 49  
 "Dying Gladiator" in Rome, 101  
 EGYPT, Arts of, 17  
 "Eirenè," 65  
 Ephesus, Temple at, 39, 45  
 Etruria, 22, 36  
 Etruscans, 10, 22, 25  
 FALTERONA, Lake of, 26  
 "Fleeting Opportunity," 76  
 GAULISH bronzes, 86, 93, 98  
 "Gaulish Woman," 5  
 Greek vases, 30, 32, 33, 35  
 HADRIAN, 7  
 Heracles, 6, 26, 27, 35, 76, 94, 98  
 Heracles, Tyrian, 90  
 Herculeanum, 7

- "Hermes," 20, 26, 49, 52, 65, 66, 68, 72,  
     75, 90  
 Homer, 63, 76, 101  
 "Hypnos," 19, 20, 71, 72, 76  
  
 IONIC temples, 39, 40  
  
 "JOAN of Arc," 5  
 Jupiter, Temple of, on the Capitol, Rome,  
     36  
  
 "KAIROS," 75, 76  
  
 LATERAN Museum, 52  
 Leonardo da Vinci, 46  
 "Lover, The," 12, 13  
 Lucian, 94  
 Lysippos, 6, 42, 45, 49, 73, 74, 75, 76, 81,  
     82, 87, 88  
  
 MARATHON, Battle of, 58  
 "Mars," Statuette of, 93  
 "Marsyas, the Satyr," 51, 52, 53  
 Medusa, Masks of, 93  
 Metellus, 85  
 Mikkiades, 21  
 Miletus, 10, 11, 13, 15  
 Mirror-cases, 7  
 "Muses of Mantinea," 68  
 Mycenæan Age, 102  
 Myron, 50, 51  
 Mys, 56  
  
 NAPLES, Museum of, 7, 82  
 Nero, 7  
 Nikè, 16, 21  
 "Niobe, Children of," 63  
  
 OGMIOS (Gaulish Heracles), 94  
 Olympia, 6, 8, 54, 58, 59, 65  
  
 "PALLADION," 56  
 "Pandora," 25  
 Parthenon, Frieze of, 50, 54, 63, 67, 68  
 Pausanias, 12, 56, 57, 58  
 Peirenè, Fountain of, 10  
 "Peleus," 35  
 Pergamos, King of, 101  
  
 "Perseus," 33  
 Persia, 15  
 Perugino, 58  
 Pheidias, 25, 44, 45, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 63,  
     64, 65, 93  
 "Phrynè," 76  
 Pliny, 9, 11, 12, 20, 21, 22, 36, 39, 44, 45,  
     52, 72, 74, 75, 76, 86, 90, 93  
 Plutarch, 88  
 Polycleitos, 42, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 72  
 Polygnotos, 40  
 Pompeii, 7  
 "Poseidon," 76  
 Praxiteles, 19, 42, 45, 52, 65, 66, 68, 72,  
     73, 75, 76  
 "Pygmalion," 25  
 Pyrrhus, Defeat of, 82  
  
 QUINTILIAN, 40, 42, 76  
  
 RAPHAEL, 58, 93  
 Roman conquest of Gaul, 101, 102  
  
 SLEEP, Ænigma on, 71  
 Sleep, God of, *see* Hypnos  
 Sulla, 6  
  
 TANAGRA, 8, 26  
 Tarentum, Colossus at, 81  
 Tarquin, King of Rome, 36  
 Terra-cottas, 8, 9, 30, 36, 39  
 Terra-cotta quadriga, 36  
 "Thetis," 35  
 Tiberius, 74  
 Tuscan schools, 41  
 Tuscan temple, 36  
 "Tyrannicides, The Two," 23, 24, 25  
  
 VAISON, 44  
 Vatican Museum, 74  
 Veii, 36  
 "Victory," 13, 15, 16, 20, 54, 60  
 Vitruvius, 46, 49  
  
 XERXES, King of Persia, 23  
  
 "ZEUS," 13, 20, 54, 58, 60, 63, 64, 81, 88  
 Zcuxis, 59

THE END





VICTORIA UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY



